

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
KURRELMAYER, W.—Early Sixteenth Century German Lexicography, . . .	289
SCHAFER, AARON.—A Theocritean Idyll in French Poetry, . . .	300
SCHUELLER, H. M.—The Renaissance Forerunners of the Neo-Classic Lyric, . . .	310
ALLEN, LOUISE D.—The Literary Background for Claudel's 'Parabole d'Animus et Anima,' . . .	316
CHAMBERS, F. M.—On the Attribution of a Provençal Poem, . . .	320
SHAW, E. P.—Two Unpublished Satirical Songs of Jacques Casotte, . . .	322
BROWN, DONALD F.—Chateaubriand and the Story of Feliciano in Jorge Isaacs' 'Maria,' . . .	326
HIGHET, GILBERT.—Classical Echoes in 'La Araucana,' . . .	329
WALDOCK, A. J. A.—Mr. Edmund Wilson and 'The Turn of the Screw,' . . .	331
HASKER, RICHARD.—Spenser's "Vaine Delight," . . .	334
NEARING, HOMER, JR.—"The Penalty of Adam," . . .	336
VORDTRIEDE, WERNER.—The Trial of the Books in Goethe and Cervantes, . . .	339
ALLEN, D. C.—Donne's Phoenix, . . .	340
FRANÇON, MARCEL.—Sur deux additions faites par Rousseau à son premier discours, . . .	342
SHAVER, C. L.—The Publication of Hannah More's First Play, . . .	343
SHAVER, C. L.—Wordsworth's Debt to Thomas Newton, . . .	344

REVIEWS:—

CHARLES DEDÉYAN, <i>Essai sur le Journal de Voyage de Montaigne</i> ; IMBRIE BUFFUM, <i>L'Influence du voyage de Montaigne sur les Essais</i> ; CHARLES DEDÉYAN, <i>Montaigne chez ses amis anglo-saxons</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.] . . .	345
J. F. DE SIMONE, <i>Alessandro Manzoni: Esthetics and Literary Criticism</i> . [Joseph Rossi.] . . .	348
G. H. HEALEY (ed.), <i>The Meditations of Daniel Defoe</i> . [Arthur Secord.] . . .	350
EDUARD BEREND, <i>Jean Paul und die Schweiz</i> . [E. V. Brewer.] . . .	352
HUGO VON HOFMANNSTHAL: <i>Gesammelte Werke in zwölf Einzelausgaben: Die Erzählungen</i> . [Walter Naumann.] . . .	354
G.-E. BROCHE, <i>Examen des remarques de Racine sur l'Odyssée d'Homère écrites à Uzès en 1662</i> . [Georges May.] . . .	346
D. A. STAUFFER, <i>The Nature of Poetry</i> . [Clement Brooks.] . . .	357
BRIEF MENTION: H. P. VINCENT (ed), <i>Letters of Dora Wordsworth</i> ; H. C. J. GRIERSON and J. C. SMITH, <i>A Critical History of English Poetry</i> , . . .	359
CORRESPONDENCE: PARADISE LGST 1, 549-55, . . .	360

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas,
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

HAZLITT IN THE WORKSHOP

THE MANUSCRIPT OF *THE FIGHT*

TRANSCRIBED,

WITH COLLATION, NOTES, AND COMMENTARY

By STEWART C. WILCOX

Although "The Fight" is one of William Hazlitt's most famous essays, not until now have his admirers been able to examine it in manuscript. The holograph is especially revealing because so few Hazlitt manuscripts have survived, and because it was written after he had finished his apprenticeship and grown into his true, familiar genius. In its original form, however, "The Fight" was almost two essays in one—the story of the great battle between Neate and Hickman interlarded with effusive digressions upon Sarah Walker, heroine of the *Liber Amoris*. Fortunately he expunged his sentimental digressions and so preserved the unified story and hearty mood of his masterpiece.

In *Hazlitt in the Workshop* the Morgan Library holograph is for the first time transcribed, and provided with collation and notes. In accompanying commentary the editor examines Hazlitt's writing habits in order to illuminate his methods of composition and revision, and his sense of structure and style. For this purpose four sources of information have been drawn upon: accounts of his writing habits by his friends and relatives, his own statements about his methods, the manuscript of "The Fight," and his other personal pieces. The conclusions should interest both admirers of Hazlitt and readers of the familiar essay.

Bp. xii + 94 pages. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103.
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ora
the
ipt
len
the
of
uo-
not
P.,
ora

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXII

MAY, 1947

Number 5

EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

Ulrich Artzt (d. 1527), a former burgomaster of Augsburg, was the representative of his city in the Suabian League at the time of the Peasants' War. Numerous reports, accompanied by papers setting forth the demands of various groups of the rebellious peasants, were sent home by him, and were ultimately deposited in the archives of Augsburg. In the years 1881 ff. they were brought to light by Wilhelm Vogt, and published in the *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg*.¹ Only a small portion of the letters are by Ulrich Artzt himself; all the documents, however, are of contemporary origin (1524-1527), and most of them reflect the every-day speech of the common man. For the most part they come from the adjacent districts of Suabia. Military terms do not play as important a role as the constant fighting that is recorded might lead one to expect. Words not in the *DWb* of the Grimms are marked with an asterisk.

ABFAHRT, f.: so ains (i. e. ein erbgut) verkauft worden oder durch absterben in ander hend komen ist, hat das allweg funf schilling auf und sovil abfart geben, und hats die herrschaft umb das gelt . . . neher zu handen nemen mugen (p. 42); *DWb* without example.

¹ "Die Correspondenz des schwäbischen Bundeshauptmanns Ulrich Artzt von Augsburg a. d. J. 1524 und 1525. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Schwaben von Dr. Wilhelm Vogt. Separat-Abdruck aus der *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg*. VI. Jahrgang. 3. Heft. Augsburg, 1880." (This is the title on the cover of the first fascicle; there are four fascicles, whose pagination, in the reprint, has been changed so as to run from 1 to 610, without indication of their place in vols. VI, VII (and perhaps VIII, IX) of the *Zeitschrift*).

ABFRETZEN, n.: mußen solch abfretzen, zertreten und verderben des unsern . . . teglich vor unsern augen sehen (562); *DWb* cites Frank, *Chronik* (1531?).

ABRICHTEN, bezahlen, v.: auf phinztag darnach wellen wir die knecht und ander Kriegsfolck abrichten und urlauben (521); *DWb* records a similar use from Philander.

ABSCHLAG, m.: wiewol wir uns kheins abschlags zu euch ver- sehen, so begeren wir doch eur antwort (194); *DWb* cites Werder, 1632.

*ÄCHTIG, adj.: und lig daran nit, obgleich die von Memmingen nit für bennig und ächtig gehalten worden . . . wo si von Mem- mingen ächter und bennig weren, oder dafür gehalten wurden (322).

*ÄHNLEIN, n.: darob ain gancze gemaind gröslich beschwert ist, die doch mir farerbe von enlin und von anne und och von vatter und von mutter und wa die were, da ire vetter enpfielle oder iere man (42): the editor defines *enlin und anne* as *Großvater und Großmutter*.

ANFORDERUNG, f.: wo ir aber gegen uns und den unsern ur- sachen oder anforderung zu haben vermeinten (195); *DWb* without example.

*ANGEBÜHR, f.: hab ich euch neulich geschriben, das ir euer angebür laut meins vorigen schreibens erlegen sollten (86); com- pare *Gebührniß*, below.

ANSTALL, m.: unser achtung und schetzen ist, das die paurn den anstall uf iren vortail auch thuen (31); *DWb* cites Dasypodius.

ART, f. *Gegend*: sie sind "von unden an von der Steyrischen art gegen Schlemingen und Rastett zu den feinden zugezogen" (509); in suma es ist ain söliche grosse verräterei in dyser art, das nit darvon zu sagen ist. ich hab mein lebenslang nie grösser sorg tragen. mich reut das gut gelt, das fyl umbsunst außgeben wiert (514). *DWb*. I, 568 points out that there is a single instance of *ard* in the *Heliand*, where it signifies *mansio*, *aufenthalt*, and that there are numerous instances of *eard* in Anglo-Saxon, with the meaning: *habitaculum*, *patria*, *solum*, *grund und boden*. Simi- larly, in the *Sachsenspiegel*: *swenne de koning uppe sessische art kumt, cum rex fines Saxoniae attigerit*. For modern German Grimm differentiates six different meanings of *Art*, but none in the sense

of Gegend. This stands out even more clearly in two instances each of *Landart* and *Landsart*:

nachdem sych ain ersame landtschaft diser landart in ain chrystlich verainigung verbunden dem almechtigen zu lob (74); Item wo schloßer wurdend sein diser landart gelegen und nicht in dise christenliche vereinigung verbunden sind, sollen die selbigen inhaber der schlosser frundtlicher meinung ersucht werden (77); zu wissen, das uns glaublich angelangt hat, das die bauru vor Memingen sich sterken, auch umb unser landart dem andern man aufbieten, wiewol etlich pauren willig, aber der merer tail ganz unwillig (346); wie aber das mandat . . . angenommen werden, ist uns nit wissend. aber von den paurschaften an unser landart befinden wir, das sy geren sehen, das die sachen vertragen wurde (347).

ARTIKELBRIEF, m.: auch lat unser oberkait alle jar lesen ain unformlichen ungeschicktn artigkel-brief, der wider alle billichait ist (571).

*BANNsCHATZ, m.: den clain zehend well mir nit gen, noch kein seelgret, opfer und andre unedige (unnötige) stück, als besincknus, banschatz, leibpfennig, forstpfenning, kelberpfenning und derglychen (553).

*BEDROHUNGSWEISE, f.: mit selbszündenden puchsen und in ander bedroungsweys vergewaltigt (502).

BEHOLZEN, v.: das ein yeder inhaber diser mulin sich daraus zu seiner notturft wie vorgemelt beholtzen und desstattlicher erhalten muge (34); *DWb* not in this sense: 'mit Holz versorgen.'

BEIMESSER, n.: hat er ein beymesser außgezogen hat der jung vermaint, er wöll oder werd in durch die bagken stechen (67); *DWb* cites Würtz (1612).

BENENNTLICH, adj.: mir und denen so ich zu beystand vermag uf einen benentlichen tag an das ort (432); *DWb* cites Ayser.

*BERÄTIG, adj.: Also seyn wir berätig worden, wollen wir anderst nit mit schmach und schanden besteen (142).

*BESCHLUSSLICH, adj.: haben wir euer weissheit in freundlicher maynung nicht mögen beschlussliche antwort geben (276).

BESINGNIS: als besincknus, banschatz, leibpfennig (553); *DWb* cites Frank, *Weltbuch*.

*BEUTMEISTER, m.: das von iglichen venlin einar verornat werde zu einam beitemeister (201).

*BIBLICHEIT, f.: so sie in scheyn des evangeliums uben in vil articuln ungegront, dem evangelischen gotswort und der biblicheit entgegen (132).

*BITTIG, adj.: Zu VII sind mir bittig und retig, daß man uns beliben laß wie von alter her (576); Zu X sind mir bittig, das sy is die herschaftecker lihit, auch dienen, die herschftlit sind (577).

BRACHACKER, m.: die brachäcker uns zu abpruch und nachtail verbannen (558): *DWb* cites Dasypodius.

BRANDMEISTER, m.: doch villeicht gemaine stende ainen prantmeister verordnen (126): *DWb* cites Fronsperger (1578).

BRANDSCHATZ, m.: an den 1000 gulden prantschatz . . . von denen von Ransacker prantschatz 500 fl. . . haben die von Silingen fur prantschatz bracht 85 fl. (273): *DWb* cites Hätzlerin.

BRANDSCHATZUNG, f.: das ir und das ander kriegsvolck ain treflich prantschatzung einemen sollet. wo dem also, wist ir, weme die prantschatzung zugehört (126): *DWb* cites Fischart, *Bienenkorb*.

BUNZE, ein Weinmaß: das sy in disen schweren leufen alle nacht ire puntzen auf den kärren und die obgemelten kupferin gefäss voll wassers halten und so feur aufgieng . . . zufaren sollen (128): *DWb* cites Henisch and Achmeller.

*ECKERSCHWEIN, n.: So sind mir beschwert mit iren eckerschwinen in wismedern oder in holzmeder. so got ecker git, so bit mir (574).

EHSCHATZ, m.: Item zum zwelften, so vermainen sy von keinem gut kain eeschatz zugeben (27); *DWb* records only: *Eheschatz*, *Brautschatz*, which cannot be the meaning here. Possibly a scribal error or misprint for *Erschatz* (below): just 12 lines below this passage there is a misprint: *Doppelte Copie*.

EIGENSCHAFT, *servitus*: trungen sind worden, das sie sich in die eigenschaft haben müssen ergeben, auch wenn ainer oder aine sich zu meins herren von Kempten hyndersessen verheytrat, so muessen derselbig oder dieselben sich auch in die eigenschaft ergeben (35): *DWb* cites Frank, *Chron*.

ERSCHATZ, m.: Item zum dritten, so seyen wir beswert mit dem erschatz oder handtlon und ist yetz unser pit, fürohin söllich

erschätz oder handtlon abgestellt werden, sonder uns by zimlichen zinsen, renten und gülden zu belyben laussen (549); Für das 5., so wel mir fürohin kain erschatz mer geben, doch das man uns in demselbigen halt, wie hinder und for uns gehalten wiert (550): the coupling of *Erschatz* with *Handlon* makes its meaning perfectly clear: 'abgabe vom lehngut bei eintretendem wechsel des belehnten oder belehnenden' (*DWb* III, 954, where the etymology is not definitely fixed).

*ESSELI, n.: Item die wasser begern wier nit gemain sein, aber so ainer, der kranck wer oder ain schwangere frou hätt, aungefärlich ain essely visch oder kerps (kreps) fachen migen (551): probably diminutive of *Essen*; *DWb* records also Esseling, *weißfisch*.

*EXCEPTION, f.: dise ejecepcion, replic, duplic und müntlich fürtrüg haben wir nach baider tail rechtsatz erwegen (322): *ejecepcion* can only be an error for *excepcion*.

*EXCIPIREN, v.: wider dieselbigen gegenlag maister Niclaus ejeicipirt, das nach ußweisung der recht, der im bann und acht sey, im rechten nit clagen mög (320): the spelling *ejeicipirt* must be an error.

*FAHRERBE, n.: da staigt er unß unsere erbgietter darob ain gancze gemaind gröslich beschwert ist, die doch mir farerbe von enlin und von anne und och von vatter und von mutter (42): the context makes probable that this is a compound of *Erbe*, n., with *Fahr*, m. *unus e majoribus*, rather than *Fahr*, f., *res mobilis*.

FALLGUT, n.: Item der gietter halb, so begriffen sind in unserem dorf und nenn sich die valgietter, ist unser maynung, so die ledig werden, das man die nit sell staigern (569): *DWb* cites Hohberg (1716).

FÄNDLFÜHRER, m.: indem so sie sich in gnad und ungnad geben, möchte man die fendlfierer und haubtleut gedencken (141): *DWb* records *Fahnenführer*, but without example.

FEIM, m.: dass wir von wegn des armen folck nit lang in der keichn siezn. es ist ein faim von alln possen puebn, dy aber all verloffn sein (455): *DWb* records *Feim* only in the literal sense of *scum*, not in the transferred sense of *trick*, which we have in *abgefeimt*.

FELDFLUCHT, f.: aber aus irm wenden ist ain feldtflucht worden (134): *DWb* cites Waldis.

FELDGESCHÜTZ, n.: das in kein weg zethun sey, dass wir on veldgeschütz die reyster und fußvolckh abfertigen (70): *DWb* gives no example.

FINANZISCH, adj.: dweil die alten mit subteilen erdichten und finanzischen lüsten dz ir an seelgerait odergleichen stiftung zu geben verführt sein (258): *DWb* cites Kirchhof (1602).

*FORSTPFENNING, m.: stück, als besincknus, banschatz, leibpfennig, forstpfenning, kelberpfenning und derglychen (553).

FRIAT, m.: so ainer ainen sun oder tochter mechten ir ain frumen schafen ainß friacz halb usserhalb der seiner gietter (40); so ainer ainen sun oder dochter ir ain frumen schaffen ain friacz halb usser seiner gietter (552): *DWb* has only the feminine, *Freite*. See *Lexer*.

*FRIEDBIETEN, n.: ufrur bewegte . . . soll die nechst person in waß stand sy sye macht habend fried zubieten, der sol von stund an by dem ersten frid rieffen oder bieten gehalten werden. wölchs solchs fridbieten nicht halten wurd, der sol nach seiner verschuldung gestraft werden (76).

*FRIEDSBRIEF, m.: dass etlich priester mich angesucht und erbeten hand fridsbrief zu geben, han ich user not der lybsnarung denselbigen durch den statschryber zu Betwor fridsbrief machen lassen (206).

FRONTIER: Ostrach, ist ain platz so den baiden frontieren in das Hegau und das land Wurtenberg zu ziehen gelegen (192).

GEBÜHRNISZ: dann es haben die mererteil von fürsten und andern ir gebürnuß schon erlegt und bezalt (86): *DWb* cites Steinbach.

*GEE, n.: haben wir mit inen daruf gehauen, sind sy ganz zerstreut fluchtig worden; und wiewol wir inen durch das gee gar weyt haben muessen nacheylen, so seind dannocht ungeverlich bis in 2^m tod und alle ire wegen und geschutz bliben (299).

*GEISELPERSON, f.: hab ich die gyselpersonen noch by mir und sy gemant, die sachen zu fürdern (231).

*GENICK, m.: nun ist das holz so dickh, daz nit muglich gewest ist mit dem raisign zeug was zu schaffen. und wie wir daz holz verhuet, haben die paurn ain gnickh und ain gefell gemacht, daz man in weder zu ross noch zu fuess nicht hat abrechen mugen, sonder sy sturmen muessen. indem hat man nach den knecht ge-

schickht, ist der vorlorn hauf komen und habn mit den paurn zu werkh gangen . . . die paurn uber die merkhlich groß wer die sy gethan habn sein etwas hinder sich getreten, also daz unser knecht zu inen in den genickh und gefell kommen sein, haben die paurn . . . ob IIII^m im holz erstochen und erschossen (293 f.): the meaning of *Gefälle* is clear enough: "eine durch gefällte bäume künstlich unwegsam gemachte stelle (vergl. gebücke *verhau*), wie sie sich zumal im gebirge . . . von natur darbotten" *DWb* IV. I, 1, 2096). *Genick* must have a similar meaning, and is to be connected with *neigen*, *nîgen*. The form *Gebücke*, cited by Grimm, is connected with *biegen*. Under the word *Gebücke* (*DWb* IV. I, 1, 1879), reference is made to Low German *knick*, *hag*, *verhau um einen wald*, which is, of course, our *Genick*. The *DWb* connects L. G. *knick* with the verb *knicken*.

GETUSEL, n.: so das hemlich getusal grossan schadan hat gebracht den Israheliten, wollan wir alla mitari verbotan haben (200): to be connected with *tuscheln*.

GEZIRK: Als sich die emberung under dem baurman dises gezyrcks herumb am ersten erherpt (for *erhept*?) (570).

GLÖSSL, m.: da mugt es woll aufpauen und last es den herrn iren glössel (glüsten) nit zue (443).

GROSZNOT, f.: nit dz wir in disen sachen wider unsere gegebne brief und sigel fechten, besonder die großnot eraischt, das dan wölher ain gut biß hieher hat wölle bstan (572):

HAHN, ROTER: dermassen dass ich besorg die rotten hannen werdend uf der abtey kregen (181): *DWb* cites Mathesius (1687).

HALBIEH, n.: "vieh, dessen nutzung zwei je zur hälft ziehen, indem der eigenthümer dasselbe dem andern auf dessen weide oder in abwartung übergibt": Item er iecz mit uß angefangen ain nyigen bräuch und uns verboten, das kainer sol kain halbfiech han, und hat uns sein amptman verkind vor der kierchen, es selle yedermann daß halbfiech von im thon und mit sein gmayder thaylen (568): *DWb* refers to Mone and Schmeller.

HANDLOHN, laudemium: die ledig zel und hantlöner, hoptrechter, vell, fastnachthennen, hüner, ayer, und wisatschilling uß bit nachzelausen (50); das sy iere gieter also mit handtlon und in ander weg deß ringer bestanden haben (56); so seyen wir beswert mit dem erschatz oder handtlon und ist yetz unser pit, fürohin söllich

erschätz oder handtlon abgestellt werden (549); die valgietter . . . so die ledig werden, das man die nit sell staigern, och die liechen on handlon (569); wir sind auch ab den hantlonern parlich bschwart und begerend, das man ain yeden . . . laß bleyben (572): cf. *DWb* IV. II. 403.

*HEIMGEDEIHEN, v.: musten . . . unser guter verlaßen und in kurzer zeyt mit weyb und kynden dem bettel heimgedeyhen (564).

*HEIMSETZEN, v.: auf weliche handlung sy erstreckung solichs tags uns zu undertenigem gefallen heimgesetzt (324).

*HERRSCHFTACKER, m.: Zu X sind mir bittig, das sy is die herschaftecker lihit, auch dienen, die herschaftlit sind, und 1 jachart lihit wie von alter her (577).

*HERRSCHAFTLEUT: see under *Herrschaftacker*.

*HEUGELD, n.: den halben tayl hausszeins und heewgelt och geben, wenn doch die gietter . . . beschwärt worden sind (551); Item zu dem andern, so hat ein hub geben 4 lb. zeinß oder heugeld, yecz so hat man unß dreisig schilling druf geschlagen (567); wir sind auch ab dem heugelt übel bschwart, da begeren wir auch ainer milterung (572).

*HEUWACHS: söll ainer gemaind yren hirten lassen, wen sy sind sunst beschwert genuog an hewachß und an wunn und an waid (45).

*HINTERSICHBRINGEN, n.: und etliche mittel zu der gutlichait furgeschlagen und dieselben auf hindersichbringen angenommen haben (117).

*HINZ, conj.: solher frid ist uns gehalten worden, hintz unser obrigkait all ir stift und stor (?) habn einbracht (497).

*HIRTENEI, n.: weder gült noch hyrtenayer mer geben, dann wir verhoffen solichs alles von götlichem rechten nit schuldig zu sein (556).

HOCHGEWILD, n.: und unser oberkait zu eren dem hochgewild nit nachrayzen, noch beschedigen (565): *DWb* cites Maaler.

*HOLZMÄDER: So sind mir beschwert mit iren eckerschwinen in wismedern oder in holzmeder (574).

HOLZMARK, f.: hab ich auch meinem bruder Jörigen von Rot in ansehung der holtzmarken VI^M und etlich hundert guldin . . . geben (47).

*HOLZMARKUNG, f.: damit die mulin also fur und fur durch ine

und sein nachkomen mit diser holtzmarkung in guter bestendigkeit underhalten und versehen werden muge. es ist auch unser maynung nit dieselben holtzmarkung in unsern oder anderer hindersässen nutz zu wenden oder zu verkaufen, ist auch bisher durch unsere vorfarn oder uns das wir einicherlay aus diser holtzmarckung in unsern oder der unsern nutz gewendt haben nit beschehen (33, 34).

*INJURIREN, v.: das ist sein mechtikeit glori und er sol nit injurieren schmehen und unniß bruchen (199).

*KÄLBERPFENNING, m.: unedige stück, als besincknus, banschatz, leibpfennig, forstpfenning, kelberpfenning und derglychen (553).

*KORNBEHALTNUS: nachdem wir an disem ort kein kornbehalt-nus oder casten haben (33).

KORNGULTE, f.: unsers stifts hindersässen in disem ambt haben . . . unser korngulden . . . williglichen gefurt (33): *DWb* cites Höfer.

KRIEGSSTÜCK, n.: das keinar kein krigsstuck pruch, wo einar einam vor zehen jaren . . . beledigt hete und das itzund usrichten wolte (200): *DWb* cites *Gargantua*.

*LANDART, Gegend. see above, under *Art*.

LANDSART, Gegend: see above, under *Art*: *DWb* cites *Zimmrische Chronik*.

*LANDNOT, f.: wen aber ain landnot angat, wöl wir mit leib und gut helfen rötten (572).

LEHENTRÄGER, m.: verhoff . . . als lechentrager deß hauchlo-blichen ertzherzogthumbs Esterreich gehandhabet werden (56): *DWb* cites Maaler.

LEIBPFENNIG, m.: besincknus, banschatz, leibpfennig, forst-pfenning, kelberpfenning und derglychen (553): *DWb* gives no example.

*LUPFERUNG, f.: erkennen, daß ich die zyt solcher handlung nit allain sonder selb vierd geritten und gangen bin und nit lupferung haben megen, das etlich priester mich angesucht und erbeten hand (206): presumably connected with lupfen, *laxare*, *solvere*.

*MALEFIZPERSON, f.: in der herrschaft Matrey etlich vil nit allain ufwigler oder ufrurisch, sonder auch ander malefiz-personen gefangen (537).

MANNSPERSON, f.: von ainer frawen nit mer dann vier gulden und von ainer mansperson nit mer dann zwen gulden (552): *DWb* cites Reuchlin.

MESMER, m.: des schmids halb und des mesmers halb (50): *DWb* cites *Wunderhorn* and Schmeller.

*MITSCHATZUNG, f.: ob sy . . . bauru fiengen, das nit kriegsleut wern, dieselben sollen in mitschatzung oder ander weg in die gemaine beut auch verfolgen (301).

MONATSOLD, m.: so mueß man inen . . . ain monatsold durch den ganzen haufen . . . zu geben zusagen müessen (312): *DWb* cites Maaler.

MUMSCHANZEN, v.: als die purn vor Kitzingen gelegen sein, haben sy gemumschanzt, wöllicher der erst sey, so sy die statt gewinen (327): *DWb* cites Frey (1590).

ORDINARI, adj.: auch ir etlich irer ausstenden ordinarien sold, deren sy nit vermugt, also bar bezalt sein wellen (303); daz ich auf vergangne ordinari bezalung und des berurten slachtsolds zu Böblingen gelts gnuet hab (311): *DWb* cites *Gargantua*.

PASSIEREN, v. trans.: es sollend keine raubige gietter so disen mitverwanten entwert wurden underhalten noch bassiert werden, sonder alsbald man solche erkundet . . . wer aber behaußt oder bassieren laßt, gegen demselbigen solch gleiche wie gegen den reubern gehandelt werden (78): *DWb* cites text of 1598.

*PÖBELREDE, f.: wiewol wir es für pefelrede halten und an eurer person gantz nit zweyfelu (125).

*PRAKTIZIERER, m.: wer dergleichen meutereien anfinger und practicierer sein, werdet ir on uns gewar (526).

PREIS SEIN: dz die unsren den bauren nichtz weyters verbrennent, blindrit oder sich nemyn, es seiy kain preis mer (387): *DWb* cites Polychorius (1585).

PREIS MACHEN: ain yeden nach seiner verschuldigung oder geleheneit seins guts zu strafen und die so ußgetreten gantz breiß zu machen und zu beiten (204): *DWb* cites Maaler.

PRINZIPAL, m.: und was mit denen und den principaln so under inen sind wyter fürgenomen (158); auch der rechten principal und so an gegenwertiger emberung am nechsten schuld haben Lxi gefangen (291); zu verordnen in der straf der rechten principal . . . derselben landsart die furnemlichisten und rechten principal (309); der rechten principal und aufwugler on die so entlofen achtundsechzig mit dem schwert richten (310); die rechten principal, rädlfuerer der überbliben und fluchtigen aufrüer (520): Weigand dates 1534.

RÄDELFÜHRER, m.: die rechten principal, rädlfuerer der überbliben (520); auch als bald gegen den rädlfuerern mit straf fürfaren (521); mit etlichen knechten, knappen und fluchtigen paurn von redelfuerern pis in 400 starck (525): *DWb* cites *Rädeleinführer* from Maaler.

RATIFICATION, f.: haben uns ire fendlin auch genugsamen gewalt und ratificacon [!] vorergangner irer handlung mit anzagung [!] irer plätz zu uberantworten (192): Weigand dates 1573.

***REGNIEREN**, v.: wie kann es rechtgeschaffen zugen, es rengniert nicks dann pfaffen, des maisten tayl zu Saltzburg in räten (509).

***REMITTIEREN**, v.: als er auch hieher für uns zu recht remitirt und gewisen und noch auf disen tag vor unsern hofrichter . . . im rechten hanget (34).

RENNFAHN, m.: also sind wir . . . als bald mit dem reysigen rennfanen und vorzug zu gnaden und ungnaden widerumb angenommen (288); haben wir als bald mit vier geschwader reysigen sampt meinem herren dem obristen veldhauptman inen entgegen gereicht und nemlich der renfan der erst Pfaltzgräflisch fan der Österreichisch fan und ein fan mit Gilchischen reutern (299): *DWb* cites Kirchhof (1602).

RENNHAUFEN, m.: des wir dann, als wir mit den vordersten rennhufen als wir hierzu komen seind, erfarn (284): *DWb* cites Freytag.

***REPLICIEREN**, v.: hierwider die von Memmingen repliciern und nit gesteen, das si weder in bann . . . gefallen seyen (320).

SAUERBECK, m.: Item mit den saurbecken, auch denen in clostern und spital, da dann die kupferin gefass so man zum feur braucht steen . . . daß alsdann die sauerbecken, auch die in clostern und spital mit dem wasser den obgemelten dreyen haufen zum feur verordnet zufaren (128): *DWb* cites Seuter (1599).

***SCHIEDRICHTER**, m.: von uns auch inen etliche schidrichter benent und vor denselben gehandelt werden solte (83).

SELBSZÜNDEND, adj.: mit selbszündenden puchsen und in ander bedroungsweys vergewaltigt (502): *DWb* cites text of 1603.

SINGERIN, f.: 2 singerin und 2 scharpfmezn mitzetailn (267): as name of a gun cited by *DWb* from Fronsperger (1578).

A THEOCRITIC IDYLL IN FRENCH POETRY

Perhaps the best known, after "la Jeune Tarentine," of the "Bucoliques" of André Chénier is the delightful idyll entitled "l'Oaristys," "imité," the poet tells us, "de la XXVII^e idylle de Théocrite."¹ As a matter of fact, in the words of one of the English translators of Theocritus, "the authenticity of this idyll has been denied. . . . But the piece is certainly worthy of a place beside the work of Theocritus."² The little composition, either in its original form or in the Chénier version, proved so captivating to French amateurs of Greek verse that two nineteenth-century poets, Joséphin Soulay (1815-1891) and Armand d'Artois (1845-1912), tried their hands at re-fashioning it to suit their own purposes. I should like here to examine briefly these three versions of the Greek idyll, it being clearly understood that I am not concerning myself in any way with controversies over the original among Theocritean scholars as to authenticity,³ textual variants, etc. The theme and the language of the poem are as old as time and as new as the first awakening of love in the heart of the adolescent, and, as such, they are the property of every lyric poet who has attempted to translate these feelings into words.

Chénier's "l'Oaristys" is composed of eighty-eight alexandrines with no fixed rhyme-scheme (its first twenty-three verses rhyme: *abbacdeeded fggfgggfghhg*). Its theme is the wooing⁴ of the shepherdess Naïs by the shepherd Daphnis and, in general, the poem follows the original with a fair degree of fidelity. Chénier yields here and there to the temptation of embroidering somewhat on the

¹ *Oeuvres d'André Chénier*, ed. Henri Clouard, 3 vols., Paris, A la Cité des livres, 1927 (*vide* I, 36-42). I shall refer to this work as Clouard.

² A. Lang: *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus Rendered Into English Prose*, London, MacMillan, 1920 (*vide* pp. 147-151). I shall refer to this as Lang. The translation follows the original very closely.

³ On this point, *vide* E. B. Clapp: "The 'Oaristys' of Theocritus" (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, II, 165-171, October 9, 1911).

⁴ This is the meaning of the word that serves as the title of the poem which, in Lang's translation, is given as "The Wooing of Daphnis." Lang, following the original, gives the shepherdess no name, calling her simply "The Maiden." In the Juntine edition (Florence, 1515), she is called Naïs, which may explain Chénier's employment of this name.

crisp dialogue of the original, so that his poem is about a third again as long. For example, the following line spoken by Daphnis, as given in the Lang translation: "Come hither beneath the elms, to listen to my pipe," reads in Chénier:

Suis-moi sous ces ormeaux; viens de grâce écouter
Les sons harmonieux que ma flûte respire:
J'ai fait pour toi des airs, je te les veux chanter;
Déjà tout le vallon aime à les répéter.⁵

The first two lines of the original, spoken one by the maiden and one by Daphnis, are both given to Daphnis in the Chénier version. Citation of the passages will reveal the closeness of the two texts. Lang renders the original as follows:

The Maiden. Helen the wise did Paris, another neatherd, ravish!
Daphnis. 'Tis rather this Helen that kisses her shepherd, even me.

Chénier puts both these lines into the mouth of Daphnis, who says:

Hélène daigna suivre un berger ravisseur;
Berger comme Pâris, j'embrasse mon Hélène.⁶

In both poems, the shepherdess begins by resisting the wiles of her handsome young wooer, rebukes him for taking liberties with her person, and declares herself to be a votary of Artemis; very quickly she yields to the blandishments of the Aphrodite-worshipping and marriage-promising Daphnis, and her fate is sealed in the two lines with which Chénier ends his poem:

Naïs: J'entrai fille dans ce bois, et chère à ma Déesse.
Daphnis: Tu vas en sortir femme, et chère à ton époux.

Note the close parallel between this and the Lang translation, where we read:

The Maiden. A maiden I came hither, a woman shall I go homeward.
Daphnis. Nay, a wife and a mother of children shalt thou be, no more a maiden.

The Greek idyll ends with a comment by the poet which Chénier omits, and which Lang translates in these words:

So, each to each, in the joy of their young fresh limbs they were murmuring: it was the hour of secret love. Then she arose, and stole to herd

⁵ *Vide* Lang, p. 148, Clouard, p. 37.

⁶ Lang, p. 147, Clouard, p. 36.

her sheep; with shamefast eyes she went, but her heart was comforted within her. And he went to his herds of kine, rejoicing in his wedlock.⁷

In the main, then, Chénier followed his original rather closely. His chief changes were in the direction of toning down what must have seemed bits of coarseness or unnecessary realism in the original. A few parallels will make this clear:

1. a. The Maiden. 'Tis for thee to caress thy kine, not a maiden unwed.
b. Naïs: Adresse ailleurs ces vœux dont l'ardeur me poursuit.
2. a. The Maiden. Lay no hand on me; nay, if thou do more, and touch me with thy lips, I will bite thee.
b. Naïs: Berger, retiens ta main—; berger, crains ma colère.
3. a. The Maiden. But I fear childbirth, lest, perchance, I lose my beauty.
b. Naïs: Quelle beauté survit à ces rudes combats?
4. a. The Maiden. What dost thou, little satyr; why dost thou touch my breast?
Daphnis. I will show thee that these earliest apples are ripe.
b. Naïs: Satyre, que fais-tu? Quoi, ta main ose encore . . .
Daphnis: Eh! laisse-moi toucher ces fruits délicieux . . . Et ce jeune duvet. . .
5. a. The Maiden. Thou makest me lie down by the water-course, defiling my fair raiment!
b. Naïs: Non, arrête . . . Vois, cet humide gazon
Va souiller ma tunique, et je serais perdue.
6. a. The Maiden. Thou dost promise all things, but soon thou wilt not give me even a grain of salt.
b. Naïs: Tu promets maintenant . . . Tu préviens mon envie;
Bientôt à mes regrets tu m'abandonneras.
7. a. The Maiden. Artemis, be not wrathful, thy votary breaks her vow.
Daphnis. I will slay a calf for Love, and for Aphrodite herself a heifer.
b. Naïs: Ah . . . Daphnis! je me meurs . . . Apaise ton courroux, Diane . . .
Daphnis: Que crains-tu? L'Amour sera pour nous.
Naïs: Ah! méchant, qu'as-tu fait?
Daphnis: J'ai signé ma promesse.⁸

Perhaps the most striking change introduced by Chénier involves the names of the parents of the two lovers. Whereas the Daphnis

⁷ *Vide* Clouard, p. 42, and Lang, p. 151. The poems occupy pp. 36-42 and pp. 147-151 of their respective volumes and the citations which follow are taken from these pages.

⁸ The above seven passages are transcribed without change from Lang and Clouard, respectively. The suspension points in the passages from Chénier are in the Clouard text and do not indicate the omission of words.

of the original states that "Lycidas is my father and Nomaea my mother," Chénier's counterpart does not mention his mother and gives his father's name as Palémon. Similarly, the Daphnis of the Greek poet says that the maiden's father is named Menalcas; Chénier has Naïs refer to "mon père" but not by name. Palémon is undoubtedly an invention, since it is found in none of the manuscripts of the original.

So much for the author of the "Bucoliques." We turn now to Josephin Soulary, leader of a "pléiade"⁹ of Lyonese poets and author of the brilliant set of sonnet-cycles entitled *Sonnets humoristiques* (Lyon, Scheuring, 1858). Vol. II of the three-volume Lemerre edition of his *Oeuvres poétiques* (Paris, s. d.) contains a section captioned "Variations sur un vieux thème," which consists of a six-line "Prologue" and two poems, "Dans un vallon de Co l'an 250 avant J.-C." and "Un peu partout en l'an de grâce 1864." Like Chénier, Soulary assumed that Theocritus was the author of the poem he was translating, as we learn from the "Prologue," which reads:

O Théocrite! A l'étourdie
J'ai tronqué tes vers éclatants;
Daigne excuser ma perfidie!
La France n'est pas l'Arcadie;
On faisait l'amour, de ton temps;
Nous en faisons la parodie.¹⁰

We are here dealing, then, with a rendition of the so-called twenty-seventh idyll of Theocritus and a travesty of this idyll. The translation and the parody are printed side by side, the former in italics on the even-numbered pages, the latter in regular type on the odd; the two poems have exactly the same number of lines, sixty-four of dialogue and five of concluding comment (the dialogue is written in alexandrine couplets, the comment forms a cinquain rhyming in one case aabba and in the other aabab). In his adaptation of the Greek idyll, Soulary followed the original much more closely than did Chénier, so that the two poems are of about the same length. The French poet employs the Greek pattern of making the dialogue consist of single verses spoken alternately by the two lovers; incidentally, it may be noted that Soulary replaces the less

⁹ Vide Paul Mariéton: *Josephin Soulary et la pléiade lyonnaise*, Paris, Marpon et Flammarion, 1884.

¹⁰ Josephin Soulary: *Oeuvres poétiques*, II, 53.

usual name of Naïs given the shepherdess by Chénier with the one naturally associated, because of Longus' famous novel, with Daphnis, that is to say, Chloé. And Soulary's poem closes with the comment which, as we have seen, Chénier omitted, and which I shall cite as an illustration of his use of the original:

Ainsi tous deux, cueillant la fleur de leur matin,
Gazouillaient, et, furtifs, loin du nid clandestin,
Regagnaient leurs troupeaux errants dans la vallée,
Chloé, les yeux confus, la pensée affolée,
Daphnis, le cœur en joie et le regard hautain.¹¹

By way of further illustration, I quote a few of the lines in Soulary's poem which correspond to verses in Chénier already compared with the Lang translation. "Dans un vallon de Co" begins with two lines which parallel almost word for word those of the original:

Chloé: La sage Hélène aime Pâris, un pâtre aussi.

Daphnis: Et moi, pâtre, j'embrasse une autre Hélène ici.

Similarly, the dialogue closes with these verses:

Chloé: Hélas! j'arrivai fille, et m'en retourne femme.

Daphnis: Epouse, bientôt mère, et plus chère à mon âme.

The line: "Come hither beneath the elms, to listen to my pipe," is rendered by Soulary: "Ma flûte a de beaux sons: viens sous l'orme l'entendre." That Soulary did not share Chénier's squeamishness is obvious from a comparison of the following verses with their equivalents, quoted above, in Lang (I quote in the same order):

1. Chloé: Va-t'en baiser tes veaux; respecte une innocente.
2. Chloé: A moi, Diane! A bas les mains, ou gare aux yeux.
3. Chloé: On est mère, on allaite: adieu le corps vanté.
4. Chloé: Hé! fureteur! que fait ta main dans mon corsage?
Daphnis: De ces pommes en fleurs je m'assure le gage.
5. Chloé: Tu m'as jetée à terre . . . Ah! ma robe est perdue!

Finally, in the matter of the names of the parents, Soulary differs from Chénier in following his source directly; for he has Daphnis say, "Mes auteurs sont Lycidas et Nomée" and give Ménalque as the name of Chloé's father. The Soulary rendition, thus, is much

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 68. The remaining citations occur on even-numbered pages from 54 to 68.

closer to the original than is that of Chénier and, consequently, is much simpler and more plain-spoken.

Soulary's parody of the charming Greek idyll parallels it only in structure; in theme and treatment, it is characterized by a sophistication which is in dubious taste. It is probable that Soulary made the version of the idyll merely as a pretext for the composition of the parody; if this is so, his arrow fell very wide of the mark, for the version possesses much of the youthful freshness of the original, while the parody is worthless as poetry. It is the account of the love-making of a rake who, having satisfied his desire and discovered that the girl is not the virgin he had supposed her to be, "allume son cigare et rentre à son café."¹² The poem opens with these lines:

Chloé: Qui, moi, votre maîtresse? Ah! ce mot m'injurie!

Daphnis: Tout d'abord aimons-nous; le reste est pruderie.

Chloé: Je veux bien vous aimer, mais à titre d'époux.

Daphnis: L'époux détruit l'amant; ce titre seul est doux.

To win this "title," the seducer overcomes, one by one, the objections of the victim, presumably anxious to preserve her honor. When she expresses herself as contented with her poverty, because "On est pieuse, on prie, et Dieu vous vient en aide," he flippantly counters with the warning: "Le mal de ce régime est qu'on meurt du remède." When, tempted by his promise of "maison, chevaux, laquais, bijoux," she is restrained by the thought: "Si ma mère savait!" he cynically assures her: "On tient son enfant riche en estime plus haute." From the point at which the conquest is about to be consummated, the "variation" becomes almost a verbatim restatement of the "theme" in the words spoken by the two Chloés. Note the following parallel lines, the first in each case from the translation of the idyll, the second from the parody:

1. Plusieurs se sont offerts: mon cœur n'a pas battu.
Plusieurs m'ont fait la cour: aucun ne m'a charmée.
2. Vrai? J'aurai ma maison, mon lit, ma bergerie?
Hé, dites! La maison sera vraiment à moi?
3. Ton nom? doux est le nom de la personne aimée!
Dites-moi votre nom; j'en raffole, à coup sûr!
4. Hé! fureteur! que fait ta main dans mon corsage?
Que faites-vous, monsieur? Ce n'est pas bien du tout!

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 69. The remaining quotations occur on odd-numbered pages from 55 to 69.

5. Ta main . . . retire-la. Je suis toute en émoi.
A bas la main! . . . Sortez cette main, ou je crie.
6. Ma ceinture, à présent! pourquoi la dénouer?
Vous allez déchirer ma robe, c'est indigne!
7. Le désir promet tout; puis, la soif assouvie . . .
Oui, promesses en l'air! Demain vous en rirez.

The humor of the parody lies in the answers of the nineteenth-century Daphnis and in the five-line concluding comment in which we are told that Chloé, having failed to trap her wealthy suitor into marriage, "gronde en son cœur de dépit étouffé" as Daphnis lights his cigar and goes off "fredonnant l'air de la *Dame blanche*." Soulary's metamorphosis of the Theocritean rustics is a clever *gauloiserie*.

This brings us to the poem of Armand d'Artois, "Oaristys," described, like its predecessors in Chénier and Soulary, as an "idylle d'après Théocrite." Indeed, this poem, insofar as its content is concerned, is an exact replica of its prototypes; its *raison d'être* lies in its form and in a greater emphasis on the "carpe diem" aspects of its theme which affiliates it with the poetry of the Pléiade and, more particularly, with the charming *bergerettes* of the 18th century. As examples of the latter, I cite the following brief passages, which will, at the same time, serve to illustrate Artois' style. In answer to the proud declaration of "la Jeune fille," "Je suis vierge!" Daphnis counsels:¹³

Moins de fierté!
De la jeunesse l'heure est brève,
Elle passera comme un rêve
Où comme une ombre sur la grève.

And when "la Jeune fille" hesitates to yield to Daphnis' pleas because "le mariage Traîne avec soi mille maux déchirants," the insistent wooer replies:

Erreur, enfant! L'hymen n'apporte
A ceux qu'il assembla par des liens chéris
Que des plaisirs de toute sorte:
Pas de chagrins, mais les Jeux et les Ris,
Pas de douleurs, mais de douces caresses!

Incidentally, it will be seen from the above that Artois is the only one of the three French poets to follow the original in leaving the

¹³ Armand d'Artois: *Muse et musette*, Paris, Emile-Paul, 1912, pp. 23-34, from which pages the citations are taken.

shepherdess nameless. Curiously enough, while following Chénier in giving to Daphnis' father the name of Palémon (instead of that of Lycidas found in the original and in Soulayr), he follows his 19th-century predecessor (and the original) in calling Daphnis' mother Nomoea and the maiden's father Ménalkas.

In form, Artois employs only sparingly the alexandrines of the Chénier and Soulayr versions, using a pattern in which octosyllabics predominate though decasyllabics and alexandrines occur. The rhyme-scheme is not fixed, couplets, tercets, and quatrains being employed at the whim of the poet. Because of the predominance of the octosyllabic verse and a marked tendency to periphrasis on Artois' part, his poem is much longer than any of the other three, its two hundred seven verses being exactly three times the sixty-nine of Soulayr's version. Moreover, the staccato alternation of single verses in the original and in Soulayr makes way, in Artois, for a succession of irregular stanzas which give to the whole a more fluid and, at the same time, more blurred outline than is the case with his predecessors. Artois' intention, obviously, was to augment the lyric elements of the poem while, at the same time, attempting to preserve its dramatic character.

In order to bring into sharper relief the similarities and differences in the four compositions, I shall cite from Artois' poem passages parallel to those already given from Lang, Chénier, and Soulayr. Artois' "Oaristys" opens with two couplets in which a predilection for ornamentation at once manifests itself:

La Jeune Fille

C'est par force, berger, que Pâris, le beau pâtre,
Triompha de la sage Hélène aux bras d'albâtre.

Daphnis

Et mon Hélène à moi, sans s'y voir obliger,
Vient de baiser sur la bouche un autre berger.

In none of the other versions is there any reference to Helen's arms, and the "sans s'y voir obliger" of Daphnis' couplet is something of a *cheville*. (Attention might be called here to the occurrence of the caesura after the seventh syllable in the second line of this couplet, a phenomenon typical of liberties taken by Artois throughout his poem.) In concluding the dialogue between the young lovers, Artois departs from the tradition in giving the last word to "la Jeune fille" who, in the following rather elaborate strophe, laments the loss of her virginity:

O ma virginité, que j'avais préservée
 D'Eros et de sa trahison,
 Tu me fuis pour jamais, en ma jeune saison!
 Ma destinée est achevée . . .
 Vierge, ici je suis arrivée
 Pour rentrer femme à la maison.

This is followed by a conclusion for which Artois needs twelve verses to say what Soulayr had said in five. It is obvious, then, that the latest of the four poems is also the wordiest.

Despite this wordiness, however, Artois does not hesitate to give literal renditions of some of the passages of the original which Chénier preferred to paraphrase. Thus he has "la Jeune fille" declare:

Berger, si, pour que tu finisses,
 Il te faut embrasser quelqu'un,
 Embrasse une de tes génisses!

Or again:

Ah! c'est l'enfantement encor
 Et ses suites que je redoute!

When she expresses, in unmistakable language, her fears of her wooer's intentions:

Que fais-tu là, petit satyre?
 Et pourquoi touches-tu mon sein?
 Finis donc! Quel est ton dessein?

he replies with a metaphor that he might have borrowed from Chénier:

De cueillir ces beaux fruits dont le charme m'attire.

She tries to ward off her fate:

Berger! berger, ton bras me pousse . . .
 Je vais tomber et salir mes habits.

And when she suspects the veracity of Daphnis' promises, she substitutes a "grain de mil" for the "grain of salt" of the original:

Oui, ce n'est rien que de promettre!
 Tu ne parles que de donner, berger subtil,
 Aujourd'hui! Mais demain, qui sait? demain, peut-être,
 Ne me donneras-tu pas même un grain de mil.

Having succumbed to her lover, she begs Artemis for forgiveness:

O puissante Artémis dont j'affronte le blâme,
 Déesse de la Chasteté,
 Pour ton culte que j'ai quitté
 Ne me regarde pas de ton œil irrité.

And, though he does so in speech more florid than is that of his Greek prototype, Daphnis makes a specific vow to the gods for the fulfillment of his desires:

Je veux aux Immortels offrir un sacrifice
 Afin que nous soyons toujours leurs favoris,
 Et je vais immoler sur leurs autels fleuris
 D'anémones et de narcisse,
 Au jeune Eros une blanche génisse,
 Une vache blanche à Cypris!

Of the three versions of the Theocritean idyll here discussed, that of Soulayr conforms most closely to the original. As we have seen, however, the presence of the parody casts some doubt on the honesty of the poet's intention in making the rendition. Chénier and Artois, on the other hand, would seem to have been motivated by a genuine desire to reproduce in their own tongue a captivating specimen of Greek pastoral poetry.¹⁴ As between the relatively simple sensuousness of Chénier and the baroque artificiality of Artois, there is probably little room for choice. But wherever individual preferences may lie, one clear if obvious fact stands out: the direct appeal of Theocritus to three French poets within the course of a little more than a century. This is but another testimonial to the amazing hold which Greek literature has had on French writers and readers from the Pléiade to our own day, from Ronsard and du Bellay to Gide, Giraudoux, Cocteau, Jean Anouilh, and Jean-Paul Sartre.¹⁵

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas

¹⁴ Leconte de Lisle, in his volume of translations of Hesiod, Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Tyrtæus, the Orphic hymns and the Anacreontic odes (traduction nouvelle, Paris, Lemerre, s.d.), includes "l'Oaristys" in its accustomed place as the twenty-seventh of the idylls of Theocritus (pp. 262-269). But as this is a very faithful rendition, in prose, of the original, it is outside the province of the present paper.

¹⁵ I wish to make grateful acknowledgment for the assistance rendered me, in the preparation of this paper, by Dr. H. J. Leon, of the department of Classical Languages of The University of Texas.

THE RENAISSANCE FORERUNNERS OF THE NEO-CLASSIC LYRIC

In an excellent article, Catherine Walsh Peltz has described the neo-classic lyric as "artificial in content, polished in style" and seeking the "flawless expression of conventionalized thoughts, reactions, attitudes concerning love making."¹ The *loci critici* for this lyric are found in the passage on songs in the Earl of Mulgrave's *An Essay on Poetry* (1682) and in Ambrose Philips' essay on song-writing in *Guardian* 16 (March 30, 1713). Miss Peltz believes that the conception of the lyric held by the majority of the poets and critics of the Restoration and of the greater part of the eighteenth century does not coincide with that held in the Renaissance. I should like to add a footnote to this idea, a partial contradiction of it: The conception of the lyric as found in Mulgrave and Philips is identical with one held in the Renaissance, and the word *song* gives us a clue: The neo-classic lyric and the neo-classic conception of the lyric derive in part from the Renaissance madrigal and "air."

In ancient Greece a lyric was a poem intended for musical performance to the accompaniment of the lyre. Both Horace and Catullus wrote imitations of such poems, but their imitations were meant for reading from a manuscript. In antiquity, therefore, the lyric was of two types, lyric poems and "lyrics" for songs; and the distinction survives today. In the eighteenth century Dr. Charles Burney defined the lyric poet as one who writes poems for music,² and Dr. John Aikin said that song is a branch of lyric poetry.³ It cannot but be that the ideals of the song should sometimes be the same as those of the lyric poem, and *vice versa*. Consequently it appears that the Renaissance madrigal and "air" could be instrumental in creating the form of the neo-classical lyric, even as was the work of writers who imitated the lyrics of Anacreon, Catullus, and Horace. The neo-classic lyric was influenced not only by Ben Jonson and his "Tribe," the literary imitators of the ancient lyric, but also by Campion and his fellows, the musical composers who

¹ "The Neo-Classic Lyric 1660-1725," *English Literary History*, XI (1944), 96.

² *The Present State of Musia in France and Italy* (London, 1771), p. 47.

³ *Essays on Song-Writing*, a New Edition, with Additions and Corrections, and a Supplement, by R. H. Evans (London, 1810), p. 17.

imitated the musical settings of poetry which came to England from Italy. The result was that the neo-classic lyric has characteristics in common with its Renaissance predecessors in song.

Like the eighteenth century lyric, the poems upon which madrigals and "airs" were based had the virtues of brevity. If the poems themselves were sometimes comparatively long, their basic unit was the short stanza. *The Triumphs of Oriana*, a collection of madrigals published in 1601 under the editorship of John Morley, contains twenty-four lyrics.⁴ A count reveals that all save one are in single stanzas, and that this one has three stanzas, each of which, as in the neo-classic lyric, is a complete thought in itself and does not "run on" into the stanza following it. In the madrigal the single stanza was common since it was almost impossible to use different stanzas for the contrapuntal type of writing of which the madrigal consisted. All of the lyrics in *The Triumphs of Oriana* end with a two-line tag (4a3b) which furnishes repetition to the entire set of madrigals and ties them together. The number of lines in each lyric minus the refrain runs from four to twelve. Two madrigals contain four lines, one has five, three have six, one has seven, four have eight, one has nine, four have ten, three have eleven, and four have twelve. The average number of lines is approximately eight. But eight-line stanzas and other of the longer ones usually break into smaller units on the basis of punctuation, and the four-line group therefore prevails. As in the neo-classic lyric, the most frequently used type of poetic foot is iambic, and trimeter lines predominate. Furthermore, longer lines in pentameter, hexameter, or septameter break into smaller units so that for purposes of musical composition the most common types of lines are trimeter and tetrameter. As for rhyme, to which Campion objected in English poetry, it is found everywhere, even in Campion's "airs," and it is always "close" because the lines are short.

The neatness and polish of madrigal verse are found also in the poetical foundation for the "air." In Campion's *Second Book of*

⁴It was not a practice to indicate the authors of the words of madrigals and "airs." Most of the poems are anonymous; a few are translations from the Italian. More poems are identified as coming from Sidney than from anyone else, but Spenser runs a close second to him. See Edmund H. Fellowes, *The English Madrigal School. A Guide to Its Practical Use* (London: Stainer and Bell, n. d.), Part IV, p. 88. Also, Edmund H. Fellowes, *The English Madrigal* (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), pp. 64 ff.

Airs (1613) there are twenty-one poems, all in stanza form, like the single example from Morley's *Triumphs*, and all conform to the standard of separability between the stanzas. Stanzas run from six lines to sixteen, but the usual number is eight. The longer stanzas break into parts because meaning is frequently expressed in quatrains which, though printed without separation, carry separate ideas. Again, tetrameter and trimeter lines are frequent, and longer lines break into these units. Even dimeter, also found in some of the verse in Wagner's music-dramas, is to be found here. Though the madrigal and the air belonged to different musical traditions, the brevity of the lines and stanzas upon which both were based was necessary to the best and most convenient adaptation of poetry to music. The shorter the poetic line, the less unwieldy is it for the composer.

It is also true that the shorter the poetic line and the shorter the stanzaic unit, the higher the degree of polish demanded of the poem as a whole. The miniature is required to have a perfection which the more diffuse and noble work need not and cannot achieve. Like the neo-classic lyric which followed them, madrigals and "airs" demanded the epigrammatic quality of which Philips spoke.

"A Song," he said, "should be conducted like an Epigram."⁸ Twice he had been anticipated in saying this, and both times by Campion. In the Rosseter book of "airs," Campion wrote that "what Epigrams are in Poetrie, the same are Ayres in musicke, then in their chiefe perfection when they are short and well seasoned." And therefore long preludes and many long rests do violence to the form of the "air." But a

naked Ayre without guide, or prop, or colour but his owne, is easily censured of everie eare, and requires so much the more invention to make it please. And as Martial speaks in defence of his short Epigrams, so I say in th'apologie of Ayres, that where there is a full volume, there can be no imputation of shortnes.⁹

In his *Two Books of Airs* (ca. 1613) Campion wrote in a similar vein. "Short Ayres," he said,

⁸ "Essay on Song-Writing," *The Guardian* 16 (1713), p. 72.

⁹ Philip Rosseter, *Book of Ayres* (1601), "Introduction to the Reader," written by Campion. See the Percival Vivian edition of *Campion's Works* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1909), p. 5; and the edition of Rosseter's book in Edmund H. Fellowes, *The English School of Lutenist Song-Writers*, Two Series, 32 Vols. (London: Stainer and Bell, 1920-1932).

if they be skilfully framed, and naturally exprest, are like quicke and good Epigrammes in Poesie, many of them shewing as much artifice, and breeding as great difficultie as a larger Poeme. . . .⁷

Campion's defense of the "air" as a complete form requiring artifice of a high quality had been anticipated by John Dowland. In the preface to Part I of his *First Book of Aires* (1597) Dowland called for "that kind of musicke, which to the sweetness of instrument applies the lively voice of man, expressing some worthy sentence or excellent Poeme," and in his reference to a "sentence" he came close to stating Campion's idea of the importance of the epigrammatic quality of the poetry of the "air."

The models for the poetry of Renaissance song were the same as those for neo-classic poetry: namely, Greek and Latin poets. The required epigrammatic quality was in Catullus and Martial, as Campion maintained, and also in Sapphic verse. Philips too was to mention Sappho, but he held up as examples also Anacreon, Horace, and the writers of French songs; he explicitly named Donne and Cowley, followers of the literary rather than of the true song tradition in the lyric, as men who used too much material in one poem for one song. In his use of the idea of song as epigram (and therefore, as Miss Peltz maintains, of the lyrical poem as epigram), Philips was close to Campion and closer to the song tradition than to the literary one.

The similarity observed between the poetic forms of which I have been speaking extends also to content or subject-matter. Though collections of Renaissance songs, notably Byrd's *Songs of Sundry Natures to 3. 4. 5. and 6. Parts* (1589, 1610) and his *Psalms, Songs, and Sonnets, Some Solemn, others Joyful, to 3. 4. 5. and 6. Parts* (1611), contain verses on a variety of subjects, even religious ones, most of the themes of the poetry of madrigals and "airs," like most of the themes of the neo-classic lyric, are amorous in nature. They are expressed in conventional amatory conceits and differ from eighteenth century themes chiefly in their complexity, though, being intended for musical presentation, they are less complex than most "conceited" Renaissance verse—a necessity determined by the requirement that what is sung must be heard quickly and understood quickly. Campion never became a "metaphysical" poet like Donne partly because as a musical composer he could not.

⁷ Vivian, *Campion's Works*, p. 114.

In the verse of the madrigals and "airs" one finds the conventional treatment of love among nymphs and shepherds in a pastoral setting; one meets with May-day settings and scenes of festive days, of wedding days, and of days of celebration like those in honor of Robin Hood. The poems are both gay and sad, but lightness and gaiety prevail. Campion admitted that the subject of his "airs" was for the most part amorous, and defensively he added, "and why not amorous songs, as well as amorous attitudes?"⁸ And in his *Fourth Book of Ayres* (ca. 1617) he said that if any "squeamish Stomackes"

shall checke at two or three vain Ditties in the end of this Booke, let them poure off the clearest, and leave those as dregs in the bottome. Howsoever if they be but conferred with the *Canterbury Tales* of that venerable Poet Chaucer, they will then appeare toothsome enough.⁹

Robert Jones, on the other hand, was indifferent to the ill effects of lusty amorousness or to any censure which such amorousness in songs should earn. In his *A Muses Gardin for Delights, or Fifth Booke of Ayres* (1610) he exulted, it seems, and apologized not at all because

In your first entrance into which Garden, you shall meet with Love, Love, and nought but Love, set foorth at large in his colours, by way of decyphering him in his nature. In the midst of it, you shall find Love rejected, upon inconstancie and hard measure of ingratitude: Touching them that are lovers, I leave them to their own censure in Loves description.¹⁰

In another respect was Renaissance song-verse like the neo-classic lyric: They both received, if they did not merit, disrespect and disapproval. The same attitude prevailed towards these genres and towards the poetry connected with them that Miss Peltz has found among neo-classic critics of the lyric poem. Giles Farnaby apologized for his "sillie" works;¹¹ and Thomas Tompkins said that "For the lightnesse of some of the words I can only pleade an olde

⁸ Campion's introduction "To the Reader" to Rosseter's book of airs, ed. Vivian, p. 4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹⁰ See the reprint of Jones' work in Fellowes' *The English School of Lutenist Song-Writers*.

¹¹ Dedication to Master Ferdinand Heaburn in *Canzonets to Four Voices* (1598), reprinted in E. H. Fellowes' *The English Madrigal School*, 36 Vols. (London: Stainer and Bell, 1916-1924.)

(but ill) custome, which I wish were abrogated. . . ."¹² Campion wrote that "as in Poesie we give preheminance to the Historicall Poeme, so in Musicke we yeeld the chief place to the grave, and well intentioned Motet. . . ."¹³ Contrapuntal "religious" music clearly still carried respect, as did the epic, but the lyrical poem, like the music it accompanied, was thought inferior as art. And yet it could be defended if one said with Campion when he wrote of the "air," that it has both its "Art and pleasure. . . ."

When Mulgrave and Philips used the word *song*, they were not being ambiguous. Their predecessors were Renaissance writers of madrigals and "airs" (and especially the latter), and the literary ideals they expressed came from theories based upon the requirements of music-and-poetry. Some of those requirements were determined by the music itself. The words of the song, by reason of the demands of music, were required to occur in short forms, and especially in short lines. Furthermore, the words of a song had to undergo those frequent repetitions which poetry-as-such finds unnecessary but which music by its very nature demands. Any form of song encourages the adoption of short, well-defined forms of verse, and any poetry, like the neo-classic lyric, in the tradition of the song will tend to adopt them too.

But the general rhythm of the song derives from the words, since the ideal of song-writers has always been to effect a veritable wedding between the words and the music. Campion's words and his music, for instance, were never intended to be printed or performed separately. The true accent was in the words, which singers sang with their true *ictus* as the composer had designed and ordered them. The music followed the laws of true speech and of poetry. Words well-spoken were the basis of the words well-sung.

And therefore the ideals of lyric poets in the Restoration and eighteenth century, the ideals of conciseness, polish and cadence, were the ideals too of Renaissance song-writers who had the necessities of two media of art to satisfy. The poetry of both groups was worldly and had a semi-narrative quality usually absent from the lyric poetry written since 1800. It had that quality of the exact propriety of words and thoughts for which Mulgrave asked, and

¹² Dedication to William, Earl of Pembroke in *Songs of 3. 4. 5. and 6. Parts* (1622), reprinted in *ibid.*

¹³ "To the Reader," Rosseter's book of airs, Vivian, p. 4.

the character of a little image in enamel for which Philips asked. It had a quality of objectivity of expression and of excessive refinement and smoothness of form. In the Renaissance song these qualities were achieved partly because the artist had to strive for the effect in performance of the perfect marriage of poetry and music. In the Restoration and the eighteenth century, these qualities were aimed for because the writer of the lyric poem had two traditions to follow: the ancient one, and the English one. And since the English one came from the Renaissance, when poetry and music had not achieved complete independence from one another, the history of the English lyric, especially of the neo-classic one, is inextricably linked with the history of English music in the song.

HERBERT M. SCHUELLER

Wayne University

THE LITERARY BACKGROUND FOR CLAUDEL'S *PARABOLE D'ANIMUS ET ANIMA*

In Paul Claudel's collection of essays, *Positions et Propositions*,¹ there is an interlude in the first essay, *Réflexions sur le vers français*, entitled *Parabole d'Animus et Anima*, inserted, he says, "Pour faire comprendre certaines poésies d'Arthur Rimbaud." The parable reads as follows:

Tout ne va pas bien dans le ménage d'Animus et Anima, l'esprit et l'âme. Le temps est loin, la lune de miel a été bientôt finie, pendant laquelle Anima avait le droit de parler tout à son aise et Animus l'écoutait avec ravissement. Après tout, n'est-ce pas Anima qui a apporté la dot et qui fait vivre le ménage? Mais Animus ne s'est pas laissé longtemps réduire à cette position subalterne et bientôt il a révélé sa véritable nature, vaniteuse, pédantesque et tyrannique. Anima est une ignorante et une sottise, elle n'a jamais été à l'école, tandis qu'Animus sait un tas de choses, il a lu un tas de choses dans ses livres, il s'est appris à parler avec un petit caillou dans la bouche, et maintenant, quand il parle, il parle si bien que tous ses amis disent qu'on ne peut mieux parler qu'il ne parle. On n'en finirait pas de l'écouter. Maintenant Anima n'a plus le droit de dire un mot, il lui ôte comme on dit les mots de la bouche, il sait mieux qu'elle ce qu'elle veut dire et au moyen de ses théories et réminiscences il roule tout ça, il arrange ça si bien que la pauvre simple n'y reconnaît plus rien. Animus n'est pas fidèle, mais cela ne l'empêche pas d'être jaloux, car dans

¹ Paris, 1927-32.

le fond il sait bien que c'est Anima qui a toute la fortune, lui est un gueux et ne vit de ce qu'elle lui donne. Aussi il ne cesse de l'exploiter et de la tourmenter pour lui tirer des sous, il la pince pour la faire crier, il combine des farces, il invente des choses pour lui faire de la peine et pour voir ce qu'elle dira, et le soir il raconte tout cela au café à ses amis. Pendant ce temps, elle reste en silence à la maison à faire la cuisine et à nettoyer tout comme elle peut après ces réunions littéraires qu'empistent la vomissure et le tabac. Du reste c'est exceptionnel; dans le fond Animus est un bourgeois, il a des habitudes régulières, il aime qu'on lui serve toujours les mêmes plats. Mais il vient d'arriver quelque chose de drôle. Un jour qu'Animus rentrait à l'improviste, ou peut-être qu'il sommeillait après dîner, ou peut-être qu'il était absorbé dans son travail, il a entendu Anima qui chantait toute seule, derrière la porte fermée; une curieuse chanson, quelque chose qu'il ne connaissait pas, pas moyen de trouver les notes ou les paroles ou la clef; une étrange et merveilleuse chanson. Depuis, il a essayé sournoisement de la lui faire répéter, mais Anima fait celle qui ne comprend pas. Elle se tait dès qu'il la regarde. L'âme se tait dès que l'esprit la regarde. Alors Animus a trouvé un truc, il va s'arranger pour lui faire croire qu'il n'y est pas. Il va dehors, il cause bruyamment avec ses amis, il siffle, il touche du luth, il scie du bois, il chante des refrains idiots. Peu à peu Anima se rassure, elle regarde, elle écoute, elle respire, elle se croit seule, et sans bruit elle va ouvrir la porte à son amant divin. Mais Animus, comme on dit, a les yeux derrière la tête.

It is interesting to speculate on what, if any, were Claudel's literary sources for this parable; whether, in this light, entertaining allegory on the aesthetics of poetry, he harks back to any of the ponderous discussions to be found in both classical and mediaeval Latin literature, where the human soul is divided into its elements, and the Animus and the Anima are given just such contrasting roles to play. The most obvious of such sources, I think, would be the third book of Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*. Here, in his poetic version of Epicurus's atomistic philosophy, Lucretius divides the human being into four classes of atoms: the *corpus*, or purely animal aspect, the *animus*, or mental, regulating influence, the *anima*, or general quality of aliveness throughout the body, and a fourth nameless substance which is the basic source of life within the human being. (This substance Lucretius generally keeps shy of in his discussion, its quality and source of existence being too elusive for definition.)² And the contrasting qualities with which the poet endows the *anima* and *animus* might well lead them to be symbolized, as Claudel has done, by Man and Woman joined in matrimony:

² Munro's notes on the third book of Lucretius (Vol. 11, London, 1908), have been helpful in clarifying this.

Nunc animum atque animam dico coniuncta teneri
inter se atque unam naturam conficere in se —

D. R. N. 111, 135-6.

And as with Claudel, the *animus* is the organizer of the two:

—sed caput esse quasi et dominari in corpore toto
consilium quod nos animum mentemque vocamus.
idque situm media regione in pectore haeret,
hic exultat enim pavor ac metus, haec loca circum
laetitiae mulcent; hic ergo mens animusque est.
cetera pars animae per totum dissita corpus
paret et ad numen mentis nomenque movetur.

Ibid. 137-143.

But beyond this point Lucretius fails to uphold the parable. Claudel describes his ménage as somewhat disturbed by the growing suspicion on the part of Animus that his wife is perhaps the more powerful figure of the two, in spite of her apparent submission. Lucretius's *animus* would have had no such misgivings. For Lucretius is a pagan, ardently engaged in disproving the immortality of the soul; and therefore no higher force could exist for him within the human being, than that which rationally governs the actions of the body.

Et magis est animus vitae claustra coercens
et dominantior ad vitam quam vis animae.

Ibid. 396-7.

But for Claudel, a Christian thinker, the belief that the soul may exist independently of the body causes the part of it most directly concerned with physical action (and devoid of function after the death of the body) to be subordinated to that part which is more intangibly situated in relation to corporeal substance. It is only with the adoption of Christian beliefs, therefore, that the *anima* gains the prestige attributed to it by Claudel.

Tertullian, then, in his acute analysis of the Christian soul, is perhaps a more plausible source for Claudel's parable. In the *De Anima*, as in Lucretius's poem, the distinction is stressed between the *animus* and the *anima*, and again the *animus* appears as the more concrete, practical force of the two:

Proinde, et animum . . . non aliud quid intellegimus quam suggestum
animae ingenitum et insitum, et nativitas proprium, quo agit, quo sapit,
quem secum habens ex semetipsa se commoveat in semetipsa, atque ita

moveri videatur ab illo tamquam substantia alia. . . . Nos autem animum ita dicimus animae concretum, non ut substantia alium, set ut substantiae officium. *De Anima*, XII.

However, the *anima* has now gained the upper hand:

Ad hoc dispicere superest, principalitas ubi sit, id est, qui cui praeest, . . . Enimvero, quis non animae dabit summam omnem, cuius nomine totius hominis mentio titulata est? . . . Ut autem et a Deo discas, animam Deus semper adloquitur, animam compellat atque advocat, ut animum sibi advertat. Illam salvam venit facere Christus, illam perdere in gehennam comminatur. . . . Habes animae principalitatem, habes in illa et substantiae unionem, cuius intelligas instrumentum esse animum, non patrocinium.

Ibid. XIII.

There are of course other possible sources for the parable, but I think that these listed above are probably the clearest examples which can be found, of the contrasted use of *animus* and *anima*. For while Lactantius also appears vaguely conscious of such a distinction,³ his conclusions are, I think, too cloudy to have inspired this parable. And while the article *animus* in Ernout-Meillet's *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*,⁴ cites many examples wherein *animus* and *anima* are used differently, it is not so much concerned with a single writer who consciously illustrates this distinction (such as Lucretius or Tertullian), as with the discrepancy in meaning between the two words throughout Latin literature in general. The examples cited show the Latin words to be used for the widely-differing concepts of *θυμός* and *ψυχή*, and illustrate the gradual substitution, in ecclesiastical writing, of *spiritus* for *animus* (and hence the French "esprit," which Claudel himself adopts as its translation). But none of the examples which the article quotes indicate an interest in the contrast of the two words so much as in the concept behind one or the other. Lucretius or Tertullian, therefore, or a combination of both, would probably be the most likely literary sources, either direct or indirect, for Claudel's parable.

Another possibility, however, and the one I believe most likely of all, is that the story has no fixed literary source at all; that its background is as general as the whole concept of the Rational and the Irrational as combined in the human soul. For if we examine the passages quoted above, we will notice that with neither Lucre-

³ Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, Paris, 1857-1903, Vol. VI, ch. 18.

⁴ Paris, 1932, p. 50.

tius nor Tertullian could there exist the subtle, almost even balance of power which Claudel pictures as existing between the *animus* and the *anima*, as either of the former writers conceive of them. For one, a pagan, the *animus* is clearly master. For the other, a Christian, it is as clearly the servant. But the Animus and Anima of Claudel's story represent two more evenly matched elements of the soul, and hence the possibility of impending domestic rupture within the ménage.

The conflict which Claudel pictures is the conflict of Faith and Reason in religion, of inspiration and mechanical technique in art⁵ — of those elements within the human soul which are at once mutually indispensable and mutually incompatible. And my belief is that Claudel took the terms, *animus* and *anima*, out of their much more limited classical and mediaeval context, simply because they denoted a verbal antithesis exactly corresponding to the distinct roles of the two figures in his story.⁶

LOUISE D. ALLEN

Baltimore

ON THE ATTRIBUTION OF A PROVENÇAL POEM

The Provençal poem *S'eu vos voill tan gen lauzar* (173, 12)¹ is attributed in four MSS (*HIKd*) to Gausbert de Poicibot; in one (*G*) it is anonymous; and in another (*D^a*) it appears as the last in a series of poems by the Monge de Montaudo. The testimony in favor of Gausbert is not so conclusive as one might think from a mere comparison of numbers; for *d* is only a copy of *K*, and *IK* are twin MSS which were presumably copied from one original.² So we have really only the word of *H* (not always a reliable source) and of *one* other witness, against the word of *D^a*—*G* being neutral.

⁵ Claudel uses *anima* specifically in the sense of divine inspiration later on in the same collection of essays. (*Op. cit.*, p. 99.)

⁶ Jung, in his *Psychological Types*, published in 1921, has made a similar convenience of the two words, using them to denote the male and female elements of the personality.

¹ This number, and the designations of the various MSS, are taken from Pillet-Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, Halle, 1933.

² See the descriptions of the MSS in the introduction to Pillet-Carstens, *op. cit.*

Some scholars, therefore, have not been inclined to accept Gausbert's authorship without question. Bartsch³ and Pillet-Carstens,⁴ to be sure, list the poem under Gausbert, and Shepard accepts it as genuine in his edition of Gausbert.⁵ Of the two editors of the *Monge de Montaudo*, the first, Philippson,⁶ includes the poem in his edition; so does the second, Klein,⁷ but among the "Unechte Lieder." And Bertoni,⁸ writing considerably later than Klein, says that the authorship is uncertain.

But I think it is possible to decide the question of authorship definitely in favor of Gausbert, and to show how the copyist of *D^a* made his mistake.

In the first place, the poem is not actually labeled in *D^a* with the name of the *Monge de Montaudo*. It follows four poems which are undoubtedly his, and it is numbered in the margin with a .v. Now, in *D^a*, the name of the poet is usually repeated before each poem, but by no means always so; and where no other poet is named, the poem in question is ordinarily the work of the poet whose name appeared last. But, as we shall see in a moment, it is almost certain that the copyist of *D^a* knew the present poem to be the work of Gausbert, and simply forgot to enter his name as a heading. The marginal number has little weight as an argument against this theory. These marginal numbers apparently formed no part of the original plan. No space was left for them, and they were merely added out at the side, probably at some later date. The person who added them assumed that any poem bearing no name was the work of the poet last mentioned; and this assumption, while frequently justified, is still only an assumption.

It has been pointed out by most of the scholars already referred to, that Gausbert de Poicibot was commonly called, in the MSS, the *Monge de Poicibot*. And this might have caused some confusion

³ Bartsch, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Literatur*, Elberfeld, 1872.

⁴ See note 1.

⁵ W. P. Shepard, *Les poésies de Jausbert de Puyebot*, Paris, 1924, p. 38.

⁶ Emil Philippson, *Der Mönch von Montaudon*, Halle, 1873, p. 29. (I have not seen this edition, but I judge from Klein's comments that Philippson accepts the poem as genuine.)

⁷ Otto Klein, *Die Dichtungen des Mönchs von Montaudon*, Marburg, 1885, p. 85.

⁸ In *ZRPh*, xxxviii, 355.

with the Monge de Montaudou. But, in the present case, I think there is another solution.

To follow the bit of detective work here presented, one must understand how *D^a* was constructed. It is a supplement to *D* (with which it is bound). After *D* was completed, its owner evidently came across another MS (or other MSS) containing poems which were not included in *D*. So he, or his copyist, beginning with the first author in *D* (Peire d'Alvernhe), and continuing with the other poets, *in order*, added any extra poems he found in his new source.⁹ He omits some names, to be sure, when he finds nothing to add; but he does not change the order of the poets.¹⁰

Now, the MS from which *D^a* was taken (or the chief source, if there were more than one), was closely related to *IK*.¹¹ The majority of the poems in *D^a* are found also in *IK*, usually in the same order under the poet in question, and almost invariably with the same attribution. It is natural to suspect, therefore, that the copyist of *D^a* found this present poem attributed in his source, as it is in *IK*, to Gausbert de Poicibot.

What happened, in all likelihood, was this: Our copyist found four poems of the Monge de Montaudou to add to those already in *D*, and entered them in his book. Then he went on to the next poet in *D*, found one new poem, and put it after the ones he had just copied. Only, here, he forgot to write down the author's name. The name of the poet who follows the Monge de Montaudou in *D* is, of course, Gausbert de Poicibot.

FRANK M. CHAMBERS

Northwestern University

TWO UNPUBLISHED SATIRICAL SONGS OF JACQUES CAZOTTE

While the following, hitherto unpublished¹ verse of Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792) belongs to the prolific *genre* of satirical songs

⁹ See Gustav Gröber, *Die Liedersammlungen der Troubadours* (*Romanische Studien* II), p. 486 ff.

¹⁰ There is one exception: Raïmbaut d'Aurenga, who comes later in *D^a* than in *D*.

¹¹ See Gröber, *loc. cit.*

¹ *Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal*, no. 6873, pp. 112-114, 119-121. The date of these songs is pure conjecture. They were probably penned between 1740

written during the eighteenth century in France and can, therefore, hardly be called distinctive, it is, nevertheless, of interest in expressing the popular opinion of various social types and classes of that period. Although Cazotte made occasional visits to secondary Parisian salons during certain years of his life, it cannot be said that he belonged to the literary aristocracy of the century. He did not pretend to write either for the diversion of the social élite or as a member of the intellectual group striving to form a progressive public opinion. Wishing primarily to catch popular fancy (until he became a serious-minded Martinist a few years before his death), he pleased the populace by attacking its favorite social targets in jovial and unpolished, if biting, rhymes.

Cazotte thus selects as those most worthy of satire from the popular point of view wealthy financiers, licentious magistrates, joy-loving priests, nobles who marry daughters of *traitants* for their money, gluttonous monks, ignorant lawyers, literary parasites, wayward beauties of the upper classes, hypocritical courtiers, and brazen fops. Particularly interesting are his remarks on the tall, lanky Englishman, possessing an abundance of common sense and blackened by the smoke of coal. It is curious to speculate that Cazotte is describing the "typical" Englishman as conceived by the average Frenchman who lacked contact with the British aristocracy or intelligentsia.²

The songs are reproduced below exactly as they are found on the manuscript.

and 1747, the dates of Cazotte's arrival in Paris from his native city of Dijon and his subsequent departure for a lengthy sojourn as a colonial official in Martinique, where his duties gave him little time for writing. During his residence in Paris, his works were characterized by the same bantering satire found in the songs, while, in his literary production following his return to France, satirical humor is replaced by greater emphasis on narrative content or on moral edification in accordance with Martinist doctrines.

² In this connection, one may note that eighteenth-century France used English technical terms in the coal industry and that, according to a memoir of 1742, "the uses made of mineral fuel by artisans and domestic consumers in France had been introduced 'à l'imitation de l'Angleterre'" (J. U. Nef, *The Rise of the British Coal Industry* [London, 1932], I, 251, 252).

1.

Il nous vient icy tous les ans
de ces Grands flandrins d'Angleterre
malades de trop de bon sens
enfumés de Charbon de terre.
voicy tous nos médicaments
mêlez le Champagne au tonerre
hantés les niinphes, les Brelans
ayez des chevaux bien fringuans
et.....flan flin flan
et Dav.....etc.
c'est le remede d'aprésent

2.

Je viens de voir un financier
que son trop d'opulence ennuye
pour un mal aussi singulier
il faut opérer de génie
voicy donc le fin du métier.
mettons la Bourse à l'agonie
un luxe bien extravagant
Eclaboussez moy les passans
Et.....flan flin flan
Et Dav.....etc.

3.

Un vieux Magistrat aujourd'huy
est venu dans notre Boutique
se plaindre qu'il mouroit d'ennuy.
dans le sein de son Domestique
ce mal est des plus de plaisant
mais j'en sçais le remede unique
la petite maison des champs
avec la Dondon de quinze ans.
Et.....flan flin flan
et Dav.....etc.

4.

L'œil cave, et le teint safrané
en débarquant du séminaire
un Prélat tout frais ordonné
implora mon ministère.
quittez cet air de Penitent
laissez moy là votre Breviaire
Rognez votre rabat d'un Cran
prenez un vis-avis Brillant
Et.....flan flin flan
Et Dav.....etc.

5.

Il vient un marquis du bel air
rougé d'une douleur profonde,
de ne pouvoir marcher de Pair
avec tous les Gens du beau monde,
dans peu vous serez aussi fier
que Seigr. qui soit à la ronde,
prenez la fille d'un traitant
faites rouler l'argent comptant
et.....flan flin flan
Et Dav.....etc.

6.

Une beauté depuis un mois
soumise aux lois de l'hyménée
voudroit bien réduire aux abois
la pudeur qui la veut Gêner
Courez les spectacles bruyans
lorgnez y, soyez-y lorgnée
mettez du fard, portez au vent
prenez des tons bien suffisans.
Et.....flan flin flan
Et Dav.....
C'est le remede d'aprésent

1.

Petit Poupon quand vous pleurez
vous n'amusez personne,
finissez donc, vous désolez
votre maman mignonne,
Et allons gay gay gay riez
quand la mamam l'ordonne

2.

Sitôt que vous aurez quinze ans
vous irez à la Guerre³
vous serez soldat, ou sergent
tambour, ou mousquetaire
et allons plan, plan, plan rataplan
faites trembler la terre.

3.

Voulez-vous etre Célestin
vous aurez large Echine
Le ventre rond, et le teint fin
sortant de la Cuisine
et allons tin tin tin relintin
faut aller à matine

4.

Voulez-vous etre un Prélat saint
la disette en est grande,
aimez le sexe, et le bon vin,
jouez votre Prébende
Et vous serez fou...etc...etc.
fouré dans la Legende.

5.

Rien qu'avoir votre oeil semillant
vous aimerez les dames
soyez poly, soyez Galant,
nous jurons sur nos ames
vous serez Cou...etc...etc.
couru des jolies femmes.

6.

Prenez des tons bien suffisants
Parlez avec audace
des petits maitres de ce tems
suivez en tout les traces
vous serez fa...etc...etc
favorisé des Graces.

7.

Voulez-vous devenir Robin
du plus joly modèle
apprenez fort peu de latin
frequentez les ruelles
vous serez so...etc...etc.
sollicité des Belles.

8.

En bons vins, en mets Excellens
que votre table abonde,
ouvrez la Bourse à tout venant
sans que rien en réponde
vous serez pris...etc...etc.
prisé de tout le monde.

9.

Voulez vous devenir auteur
de La première classe,
soyez Copiste traducteur
et rimeur à la Glace,
vous serez pla...etc...etc.
placé sur le parnasse.

10.

Voulez-vous fortune a la Cour
n'ayez remords, ni honte,
mentez, flattez, rampez toujours,
et tout au bout du compte
vous serez Ba...etc...etc.
Baron, marquis, ou Comte.

EDWARD P. SHAW

Miami University

³ L. Ducros (*La Société française au dix-huitième siècle* [Paris, 1922], p. 322) states, however, that "est miliciable tout homme âgé de 16 ans au moins (de 18, à partir de 1765) et de 40 ans au plus." It is reasonable to assume that the same age limits applied to the *troupes réglées*.

CHATEAUBRIAND AND THE STORY OF FELICIANA IN JORGE ISAACS' *MARÍA*

That Jorge Isaacs, author of the South American classic, *María*, was strongly influenced by Chateaubriand is obvious to anyone. Critics have pointed out the influence of the French master on the descriptive style of Isaacs. Sentimentality pervades the central love story of Efraín and María. The hero frankly expresses his admiration for Chateaubriand and entertains María and his sister, Emma, by reading the story of *Atala* aloud to them.

While the influence of Chateaubriand on the main plot is generally admitted, no one seems to have recognized the interpolated story of Feliciano, the slave, for what it is: namely, an imitation of *Atala*. Critics have recognized the excellence of the story¹ but have lamented its being placed within the main body of the novel in such a way as to be regarded as a distressing interruption of the main current.² Still, no one has put his finger on the motive which Isaacs may have had for writing it. That the story has a partial basis in fact seems to be established³ but that Isaacs drew heavily on his imagination (with aid from *Atala*) cannot be doubted.

To begin with, both are stories of noble savages living in a continent beyond the broad Atlantic. The Frenchman idealizes the North American Indian, while his Colombian admirer crosses the Atlantic in the opposite direction to idealize some noble West Africans.⁴ The parallelism in plot is discernible at many points.

¹ The Biblioteca Aldeana de Colombia in publishing a representative collection of Colombian tales (*Otros cuentistas*, 1936) included the story of Feliciano as worthy of representing Colombia's great author, Jorge Isaacs.

² "Un tema que debió suprimir el autor es la historia de Feliciano, la negra esclava, madre de Juan Angel; aunque brillantemente narrada, interrumpe el jadeo de la tragedia que el lector no solamente ha presenciado sino que ya se ha hecho cargo de ella." Vladimiro Bermejo: *Jorge Isaacs 1837-1937*, Arequipa, Peru. Ed. de la Colmena, 1937.

³ Rivera y Garrido in an article entitled, "Una vieja reliquia de *María*" (Buga, Colombia, 1897) gives a report of an interview which he himself had with the son of Feliciano, Juan Angel, when the latter was an old man. In it Juan Angel relates how his mother used to tell of having been the daughter of a great African chief and of having worn a gold crown on her head at the festivals of her native land. (Quoted by Velasco Madriñán in his "Jorge Isaacs, el caballero de las lágrimas," Cali, Ed. América, 1942.)

⁴ Both Isaacs and Chateaubriand pepper their narratives with footnotes

As the story of Feliciana opens we learn that her African name was Nay and that she was the daughter of the great Magmahú, military leader of the Achantis. She was in love with Sinar, a prince of an enemy nation who had been captured in war and was now one of the slaves of her father's household. Magmahú, having met with military reverses, determines to make human sacrifice to the god of the river, the victims to be his best slaves, led by Sinar. Nay must save him.

The reader will remember how Chactas was a noble Natchez who was made prisoner by the Muscogulges. The latter did not enslave prisoners of war but rather burned them at the stake. Atala, a princess of the Muscogulges, pities Chactas and helps him escape.

Both Atala and Nay show considerable knowledge of drugs and potions. It will be remembered how Chactas, the night before he was to be burned at the stake, was spreadeagled on the ground, a rope leading from each hand and foot to a stake driven into the earth, while a guardian slept on each rope. But ah! Atala had drugged the wine of all four guardians and in the dead of night she loosens her lover's bonds and flees with him. The incident in Isaacs' version is not so dramatic, but we learn that when Magmahú was preparing to make war on Sinar's people, in order to save him from fratricidal conflict Nay drugged his wine and kept him at home in a strange stupor.

The parallelism is often one of small details: The day before he was to die Chactas intoned the Natchez song of death, whose defiance so enraged a Muscogulge that he wounded him in the arm with an arrow. After rescuing him, Atala dressed his wound with a papaya leaf and her own tears. In battling the English, Sinar was also wounded in the arm but lived to have it lovingly treated and bandaged by his lady.

Everyone remembers the French hermit and missionary who consoles Atala when she is dying and so impresses heathen Chactas with his pure Christianity. A similar old French missionary sud-

explaining technical terms and quoting authorities to give authenticity to their stories, e. g. Isaacs, insisting on the nobility of his Africans, gives the following early note: "Cantu, hablando de los achantis dice: 'Son negros, pero se distinguen de las razas del mismo color, pareciéndose más a los abisinios, en razón a que tienen el pelo largo y lacio, barba, rostro ovalado, nariz aguileña y el cuerpo bien proporcionado . . .'" *María*, Ed. Sopena, p. 117.

denly appears also in the story of Nay and Sinar. The physical appearance of the two men of God is strikingly similar. Chactas relates: "j'entrevois sa barbe et ses cheveux tout trempés d'eau; ses pieds, ses mains et son visage étaient ensanglantés par les ronces."⁵ And in the Spanish version we read: "los pálidos rayos del sol moribundo, atravesando los follajes, le iluminaron la faz, tostada por los soles y orlada de una espesa barba, casi blanca . . . Las brisas del Gambia jugaban con su larga y enmarañada cabellera. Llevaba un vestido talar negro, enlodado y hecho jirones . . ."⁶

There is a variation here, for in Isaacs' story it is the man, Sinar, who is first converted by the French missionary, and then he later converts his sweetheart to his new faith.

Contrary to one's usual idea of the scanty garments worn by North American Indians and African savages, both heroines are represented as amply clothed. When Chactas was first captured and tied up by the Muscogulges, Atala came to him, as he relates: "Tout à coup j'entendis le murmure d'un vêtement sur l'herbe, et une femme à demi voilée vint s'asseoir à mes côtés."⁷ Later when she rescued him from his bound position on the ground, he opened his eyes to behold: "A la clarté de la lune . . . j'entrevois une grande figure blanche penchée sur moi, et occupée à dénouer silencieusement mes liens."⁸ In the other book Sinar takes his lady out riding on the back of an ostrich, which he leads to a quiet spot, and then:

Sinar, de rodillas, cubrió de besos los pies de Nay, pendientes sobre el mullido plumaje del avestruz, y éste halaba cariñoso con el pico los vistosos ropajes de su señora.

Muda y absorta ella, al oír las amorosas y tremendas palabras del esclavo, reclinó al fin sobre su regazo la bella cabeza de Sinar.⁹

Since Nay is represented as having a "regazo" and since merely her feet are reported to have dangled from the ostrich, the inference is that she wore a skirt of some length, although perhaps not as long as that worn by Atala, which murmured over the grass as she walked.

The custom of making utensils out of the craniums of captured

⁵ Chateaubriand: *Atala* (*Œuvres complètes*, Paris, Furne, Jouvet et Cie., 1867-72, v, 47).

⁶ *María*, p. 122.

⁷ *Atala*, p. 26.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁹ *María*, p. 119.

warriors is referred to briefly in each version. Chactas taunts the Muscogulges: "Mon père Outalissi, fils de Miscou, a bu dans le crâne de vos plus fameux guerriers, vous n'arracherez pas un soupir de mon cœur."¹⁰ And in the story of Nay and Sinar it is recorded: "Hachones de resinas aromáticas, sostenidos por cráneos perforados de cambez muertos en los combates de Magmahú, iluminaban los espaciosos aposentos."¹¹

The endings of the two tales do not correspond, although the Colombian version is hardly less tragic. Nay and Sinar are sold to slave traders and, being placed in different ships, never see each other again. Everyone remembers the tragic death of Atala from self-inflicted poison. In the one Chactas lives to mourn the death of his princess, while in the other Nay lives to be old but dies with the name of Sinar on her lips.

It is obvious that Isaacs was not only influenced by the style and sentimentality of Chateaubriand but also that he could not resist writing his own version of *Atala*, and interpolating it within the larger novel, *María*.

DONALD F. BROWN

The Johns Hopkins University

CLASSICAL ECHOES IN *LA ARAUCANA*

One of the first Spanish heroic poems which contained a substantial range of imitations of classical poetry was Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga's *Araucana*, the story of the resistance of the Chilean Indians to the Spanish invaders. Naturally, Ercilla was much influenced by the great Spanish poet who wrote the most original of Roman epics: Lucan of Cordova. Strohmeyer, in his *Studie über die Araucana* (Bonn 1929) 26 f., has pointed out some of Ercilla's imitations and adaptations of Lucan, but not by any means all.

One of these in particular is worth a brief discussion, because it is apt to escape the observation of readers unfamiliar with the classics, and has in fact been mistranslated in the recent version by C. M. Lancaster and P. T. Manchester (Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1945).

In canto 7 Ercilla describes the sack of Concepción. He explains

¹⁰ *Atala*, p. 36.

¹¹ *María*, p. 125.

how the citizens fled before the advancing Indians. Doña Mencia de Nidos tried to rally them to resist, but her stirring speech of exhortation was unheeded.

Ni á Paulo le pasó con tal presteza
por las sienes la Jáculo serpiente
sin perder de su vuelo ligereza,
llevándole la vida juntamente,
como la odiosa plática y braveza
de la dama de Nidos por la gente;
pues apenas entró por un oído,
cuando ya por el otro había salido.

The problem is the image in the first four lines. Lancaster and Manchester rashly identify Paulo with St. Paul, and translate:

O'er the brow of Paul, the Apostle,
Darted Jaculus, the serpent,
Losing neither time nor movement,
Bringing death with stinging swiftness.

Now, St. Paul did have one dangerous experience with a snake: perhaps Lancaster and Manchester were thinking of the miracle at Melita (Acts 28. 3-6). But there the Apostle was bitten on the hand, the snake was a viper, and it remained clinging instead of darting rapidly. This is a different animal, with different name and habits.

One of the great episodes in Lucan is the march of Cato and his Republican troops through the African desert, in book 9. As well as suffering the usual hardships—heat, thirst, sandstorms—the army was attacked by a horrifying number and variety of snakes, sprung from the blood of Medusa. Lucan lists them in 9. 700 f., and then describes the different types of death which struck down the soldiers who were bitten. Ercilla was impressed by the picturesque names of the snakes—haemorrhoids, cerastes, dipsas, etc.—and he furnished the cave of the magician Fiton with specimens of them, in canto 23. (Some of them reappeared later in Milton's Hell: see *Paradise Lost* 10. 521 f.) Fiton's collection specifically included

las dos alas del Iáculo temido.

This is the same animal, and the passage in Lucan tells us how it kills. Other snakes poison by their bite (Lucan does not mention constrictors), but the *iaculus*, whose name means "javelin," does not.

Ecce, procul saeuos sterili se robore trunci
 torsit et immisit (iaculum uocat Africa) serpens
 perque caput Pauli transactaque tempora fugit.
 nil ibi uirus agit: rapuit cum uolnere fatum.

(*Bell. ciu.* 9. 822-5.)

"Look, from a barren tree-trunk far off a fierce serpent, called the javelin in Africa, brandished and launched itself, and flew through the head of Paulus, piercing his temples. Poison plays no part there: death seized him at the same instant as the wound." And Lucan adds that the snake flew more swiftly than a slingstone or a Scythian arrow. By the way, he does not say that it had wings, as Ercilla does in canto 23: he appears to have thought it projected itself like a self-propelled weapon.

This then is Paulo: not the Apostle, but a Roman soldier invented by Lucan; and the snake did not dart "o'er his brow," but through his head. The image is an attempt by Ercilla to decorate the prose into which he is constantly in danger of slipping, and which asserts itself at the end of the stanza: Doña Mencia's speech, like the snake, went in one ear and out the other.

It is worth adding that Ercilla quotes Lucan's actual words, for his

llevándole la vida juntamente

is nothing but a translation of Lucan's *rapuit cum uolnere fatum*. Small as this particular point is, it is another illustration of the difficulties of studying a classically educated poet without knowing the classics with which he was familiar.

GILBERT HIGHET

Columbia University

MR. EDMUND WILSON AND *THE TURN* *OF THE SCREW*

Some years ago Mr. Edmund Wilson wrote an essay—which has since become famous, or not far short of it—on "The Ambiguity of Henry James."¹ In it he propounded a theory of *The Turn of*

¹ Published originally in *Hound and Horn*, VII (April-June, 1934), 385-406. The essay, slightly modified, was republished in Mr. Wilson's *The Triple Thinkers*, and, more recently, in *American Harvest*.

the Screw. The theory, in brief, is that the story is not a proper ghost-story at all, but a study in the psychology of a frustrated Anglo-Saxon spinster. The governess, who sees the ghosts, is neurotic and "repressed," and the ghosts are merely symptoms of her state—not "real" ghosts, but only hallucinations. No one, as far as I know, has troubled to point out that the theory is quite untenable, that—apart from general considerations—there are details within the story itself that decisively negative it.

The apparition of the man is first seen by the governess at a distance: he is on the tower. She sees him clearly enough to realize that he is unknown to her. She is strangely affected, but does not report the occurrence. The next time she sees him it is at close quarters. She takes in every detail of his appearance, and *does* report the occurrence. She describes the man she saw to Mrs. Grose, the housekeeper; and before she is half-way through her description Mrs. Grose has identified the person being described: the late Peter Quint, the valet. Two points are to be observed. (1) The identification is absolute. Mrs. Grose is not merely reminded of Peter Quint by the description: she recognizes him positively in it. The man the governess saw *was* Peter Quint, or his absolute double: this is a fact of the story. (2) Up to this moment the governess has never heard of Peter Quint.

Here are two stubborn facts of the story, and *they must be accounted for*. There are others, but these two will do, for unless they are accounted for Mr. Wilson's whole case collapses like a house of cards. "Almost everything from beginning to end," he declares, "can be read equally in either of two senses."² "Almost everything"! But what if there is one thing, one little thing, that cannot be read in either of two senses, that can be read only in one sense? What then? How strange that Mr. Wilson does not see that any such fact, however insignificant, could be the sharp little rock on which his whole theory must split.

I suggest that it does split on the fact just noted. Mr. Wilson, it is true, makes a brave attempt to steer round it.

When we look back [he says] we see that even this has been left open to a double interruption. The governess has never heard of the valet, but it has

² Quoted from the version of the essay as it appeared in *The Triple Thinkers* (Oxford, 1938), 130. Argumentatively, it would have been better for Mr. Wilson to have stuck to his original flat assertion: "everything from beginning to end" etc.

been suggested to her in a conversation with the housekeeper that there has been some other male somewhere about who "liked everyone young and pretty," and the idea of this other person has been ambiguously confused with the master and with the master's possible interest in her, the present governess. And has she not, in her subconscious imagination, taking her cue from this, identified herself with her predecessor and conjured up an image who wears the master's clothes but who (the Freudian "censor" coming into play) looks debased, "like an actor," she says (would he not have to stoop to love her!)? The apparition had "straight good features" and his appearance is described in detail. When we look back we find that the master's appearance has never been described at all: we have merely been told that he was "handsome." It is impossible for us to know how much the ghost resembles the master—certainly the governess would never tell us.³

I will not attempt to comment on the psychology of this. Let us still stick—amid the giddy swirl of these subconscious identifications, transferences and projections—to the facts. (1) "An image who wears the master's clothes." Peter Quint was the valet, and made free with his master's clothes: Mrs. Grose tells us this. So there is no reason why his ghost should not have been seen wearing them: Mrs. Grose expected that he *would* be wearing them. (2) "The apparition . . . is described in detail." He emphatically is. The man had red hair, close-curling; queer little red whiskers; eyebrows somewhat darker than the hair and the whiskers, and particularly arched; wide mouth, thin lips. He was clean-shaven except for the little whiskers, and he wore no hat.⁴

What does Mr. Wilson really mean? Is he suggesting that the master was so like Quint—queer little red whiskers and all—that the governess was capable of experiencing an hallucination of the master and of describing him in such detail to Mrs. Grose that Mrs. Grose recognized him instantly as the valet? Has Mr. Wilson (one wonders) ever really tried to make quite clear to himself what he means by that concluding sentence about the possible likeness between the master and the ghost?

Once more let us face the critical question. Let us grant, for the sake of the argument, the governess neurotic; let us concede all the "identifications" Mr. Wilson wishes. How did the governess succeed in projecting on vacancy, out of her own subconscious mind, a perfectly precise, point-by-point image of a man, then dead, whom

³ Quoted again from *The Triple Thinkers*, 125-6.

⁴ *The Aspern Papers* etc. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1922), 167.

she had never seen in her life and never heard of? What psychology, normal or abnormal, will explain that? And what is the right word for such a vision but "ghost"?

A. J. A. WALDOCK

The University of Sydney

SPENSER'S "VAINE DELIGHT"

In his successful attempt to separate the Red Cross Knight from Una by making him believe the lady false, Archimago, whose character and actions conform closely to Elizabethan ideas of witchcraft and demonology, gave to one of the spirits that he had raised the form of Una and to the other the form of a lusty young squire. Spenser then tells us that

Those two he tooke, and in a secret bed,
Couered with darknesse and misdeeming night,
Them both together laid, to ioy in vaine delight.

The Faerie Queene, I. ii. 3: 7-9

In describing the fornication of spirits as "vaine delight," Spenser has touched upon a subject of some dispute among the demonologists of his own and preceding times, who were convinced that demons had illicit relations with those women looked upon as witches, but who could not bring themselves to believe that these incorporeal and asexual creatures were capable of procreation. The possibility of cross-breeding between human and supernatural beings had been discussed by early Christian writers. The second-century Christian apologist Athenagoras, convinced of the existence of giants, believed that they were the offspring of fallen angels who had had carnal knowledge of virgins of this world.¹ St. Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei* denied, however, that angels, being made of air, could propagate, but having to admit the existence of giants since they are mentioned in the Scriptures, explained them as the offspring of ordinary human parents and cited one who had been known at Rome and whose parents were indeed normal humans. He added that undoubtedly there were more giants before the deluge than there have ever been since.² Yet in the *Quaestiones in Hepta-*

¹ Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, PG. 6. 947.

² St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, Lipsiae, 1725, II, 70-73.

teuchum he concluded a similar discussion with the statement that different people had held such varying views on the relationship of demons with women that it was difficult to have a definite opinion on the matter.³ Likewise, Hieronymus Magius, whose *Miscellanea* appeared in 1564, refused to accept the possibility of the cross-breeding of demons or angels with men, but sanctioned the notion that giants existed in Biblical times and in antiquity, although he denied for them a semi-supernatural origin. Like St. Augustine, he mentioned contemporary giants.⁴

The theories current in Spenser's time were apparently those of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, compiled by the inquisitors James Sprenger and Henry Institoris in 1486, their views being reflected in such works as Nicolas Remy's *Daemonolatrie* (Lyons, 1595) and Francesco Guazzo's *Compendium Maleficarum* (Milan, 1608). These men held that demons, able to take any form, became succubus (female) or incubus (male) devils to tempt men and women, but that the only satisfaction that they received from their fornication was that of having caused a human being to sin. To explain the fact that people were supposed to be born of such unions, they worked out the elaborate theory that a demon in succubus form would copulate with a man and retain the semen until in incubus form he could copulate with a woman.⁵

Although neither fornicator in the passage under consideration is human, demons were supposed to go to any length to accomplish their evil purposes, and although it is possible that neither of Spenser's spirits may be a demon in the strictest sense of the word, it is necessary to recall that the poet is at liberty to use his material in the way that best suits his needs.

RICHARD HASKER

Randolph-Macon College

³ St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, PL. 34. 549.

⁴ Hieronymus Magius, *Miscellanorum, seu Variarum Lectionum* in Ianus Gruter, *Lampas, sive Fax Artium Liberalium*, Francofurti, 1604, II, 1266-75. I am indebted to Dr. D. C. Allen of the Johns Hopkins University for calling to my attention the references to Athenagoras, St. Augustine, and Hieronymus Magius.

⁵ Cf. J. Sprenger and H. Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I, 4; Nicolas Remy, *Daemonolatrie*, I, 6; Francesco Guazzo, *Compendium Maleficarum*, I, ii; and Reginald Scot, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584), *passim*. Scot's work, quite out of keeping with the times, is a rational refutation of witchcraft.

"THE PENALTIE OF ADAM"

Few lines in Shakespeare have caused greater dissension among commentators than those of the Duke Senior opening the second act of *As You Like It*. Demanding of Amiens and the other lords whether life in the woods is not preferable to that of "painted pomp" and whether the woods are not more free from peril than the "envious court," the duke (according to F₁, the earliest extant text) continues:

Heere feele we not the penaltie of *Adam*,
The seasons difference, as the Icie phange
And churlish chiding of the winters winde,
Which when it bites and blowes vpon my body
Euen till I shrinke with cold, I smile, and say
This is no flattery: these are counsellors
That feelingly perswade me what I am:

Among editors and commentators there have been two principal schools of thought as to the meaning of "the penaltie of *Adam*," one holding it to be "the seasons difference," the other interpreting it as the curse of toil.

Those who consider "the seasons difference" to be in apposition with "the penaltie of *Adam*" have edited the lines in three general ways—by making the sentence a question parallel to those preceding it in the duke's speech,¹ by substituting some other word, like *but*, for the *not* in the first line, or by accepting the folio reading and attempting somehow to resolve the contradiction between "Heere feele we not . . . the seasons difference" and "These feelingly perswade."²

Contradicting Theobald, who initiated the emendation of *not* to *but* in his 1733 edition of Shakespeare, Whiter, in his *Specimen of a Commentary on Shakespeare* (1794), suggested placing a colon after "*Adam*," to make clear that "the seasons difference" is not in apposition with "the penaltie," and interpreted "the penaltie of *Adam*" as the curse of toil mentioned in Genesis 3:17, 19, 23.

¹ This approach was first made by Rowe, who, in his third edition of Shakespeare's works (1714), substituted without comment a question mark for the semicolon which had appeared after "Wind" in his first two editions.

² E. g., Caldecott (*Hamlet, and As You Like It. A Specimen of an Edition of Shakespeare*, London, 1820), apparently the first editor after Theobald to restore *not*.

Neither interpretation is quite satisfactory. On one hand, none of the devices used in identifying "the seasons difference" with "the penaltie of *Adam*" is entirely convincing. As for inserting a question mark, it is difficult to believe that Shakespeare thought of "the penaltie of *Adam*" as an advantage parallel to those which he has pointed out in the duke's preceding questions. There is no justification for emending *not*. And no attempt to reconcile the contradiction between "Heere feele we not . . ." and "These feelingly perswade" without emending the passage has made much sense. On the other hand, Whiter's interpretation, by introducing an allusion (viz., to the curse of toil) which is unrelated to the latter part of the sentence, robs the passage of the coherence which, as the comma after "*Adam*" indicates, was intended.

Evidence recently discovered by Mr. Henry N. Paul, of Philadelphia, points to Shakespeare's having intended "the penaltie of *Adam*" to refer to the knowledge of good and evil which Adam and Eve received through eating the forbidden fruit. Genesis 3:7 in the Geneva translation, a version with which Shakespeare is known to have been familiar,³ begins, "Then the eyes of them both were opened, and they^e knew that they were naked." Note *g* explains, "They began to feele their miserie, but they sought not to God for remedy."⁴ In a letter calling attention to the Geneva note, Mr. Paul writes that according to the Calvinistic interpretation, the penalty of Adam was this misery due to original sin, the knowledge of good and evil due to his eating of the forbidden tree, so that he had inflicted the real penalty on himself before being cast out into the cold and condemned to labor. The duke and his co-mates do not feel this penalty because they are no longer exposed to the insidious flattery and intrigue of the court. Rather, the differences of the seasons, which they do feel, are useful counsellors whose instruction is described in the concluding lines of the duke's speech: though the physical hardships of the forest may, like the jewel-wearing toad, appear to be loathsome, yet in contrast to the spiritual dangers of the "public haunt," they are actually "sweet," teaching one to find "good in everything." The distinction between the

³ See Richard Noble, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge* (London, 1935).

⁴ The verb "feeles" of the duke's observation seems to be echoed from this note. The spelling here is that of a 1580 edition. Dr. Hinman, of the Folger Library, has advised Mr. Paul that, while there were at least sixty-two editions of the Geneva Bible before 1600, all twenty of the editions represented in the Folger collection contain the note in question.

evils of the court and the salutary discomforts of outdoor life is echoed in the lyrics which Amiens sings in this act of the play, "Under the greenwood tree" (where there is "No enemy / But winter and rough weather") and "Blow, blow, thou winter wind" (whose "sting is not so sharp / As friend remember'd not" and despite which "This life is most jolly").

Shakespeare seems to have intended the duke's words to connote a subjective as well as an objective attitude toward evil—that is, a realization that he is as capable of doing evil as of experiencing its effects. In remarking that the differences of the seasons "persuade me what I am," the duke implies that he has escaped not only from the treacherous flattery of the court, but from the pride and greed to which it inspires him. Perhaps Shakespeare remembered that in Genesis 3 the first thing Adam and Eve do after eating the forbidden fruit is to manifest a sense of shame by clothing their nakedness—the shame implying that they have begun to feel their own capacity for wrongdoing.⁵

It is possible, then, that Shakespeare intended the passage, just as it stands in F₁, to mean something like this: "Here we do not feel the existence of evil as Adam did after he had eaten the forbidden fruit. The differences of the seasons—as represented by the icy fang and churlish chiding of the winter's wind (when which wind bites and blows upon my body, I smile and say, 'This is no flattery')—these are counsellors which effectively prevent me from succumbing to pride and greed and falling prey to flatterers."⁶ In Shakespeare's mind, it seems, the penalty of Adam was inflicted, not by a supralapsarian deity, but by Adam himself. From his greed, the sojourner in the forest of Arden, "pleas'd with what he gets," has escaped.

HOMER NEARING, JR.

Pennsylvania Military College

⁵ It is just possible that Shakespeare was familiar with a Biblical annotation in which the subjective aspect of the penalty is explicitly stated. Dr. Willoughby, of the Folger Library, has written Mr. Paul: "In 1584 Barker published a version which differs both from the normal Bishops and the Geneva version. It has this note on Gen. 3: 7: 'By the sinne of disobedience they began to feelee the corruption of their owne nature, which they sought to remedie not by seeking unto God, but by their owne deuises in couering their nakednes with figge leaues.'"

⁶ For the syntax of the passage, see Knight, *Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspeare* (1838-43), and Franz, *Die Sprache Shakespeares* (1939), § 189 and § 347.

THE TRIAL OF THE BOOKS IN GOETHE AND
CERVANTES

A poet who, through his works, or through one particular work, has contributed an uncommon share to the spirit of his time, will often find himself compelled to rebuke his followers, who, to use one of Goethe's favorite similes, are still pulling at the old snake skin which he himself has long ago shed. He will mostly choose to ridicule the spirits which he himself helped call, and of whom he no longer can rid himself, like Goethe's *Zauberlehrling*. But this ridicule, half directed against the others and half against himself, will appear as an account which the poet renders of himself, at the same time fighting, superseding, avowing and continuing to a higher plane what once was, and, of course, still is, part of himself. Many overtones, subtleties and seeming contradictions will enter such a work. The greatest example of this is Cervantes' *Don Quijote*, and in Goethe's works we have the various poems about *Werther*, and, especially, his "dramatische Grille" *Der Triumph der Empfindsamkeit* which he directed against the sentimental lachrymose books that appeared in the wake of *Werther*.

This likening of *Don Quijote* to Goethe's play is not arbitrary, because in the fifth act of the latter we find a scene which seems to have been suggested by Cervantes' book. Oronaro, the sentimental prince, the Quijote of the play, has alienated himself so much from nature and reality that he travels with many trunks full of stage properties, moonlight in boxes, murmuring springs in suitcases, which change his rooms into idyllic nature scenes. Into this false nature he puts a life size doll, his Dulcinea, which is an image of the woman he loves. He prefers this inanimate thing to his real beloved. When King Andrason, who here plays the rôle of the curate in the *Quijote* (and who is, like the curate, surrounded by women who had advised him of Oronaro's secret) discovers the doll, he finds that the whole image has a literary heart, a "papiernes Herz": it receives its lifelike posture only, because it is stuffed with books, all those pernicious sentimental books that are responsible for Oronaro's madness:

Gebt Acht, das werden Zauberbücher sein. (Er hebt eins auf.)
Empfindsamkeiten!¹

¹ Goethes Werke, Sophienausgabe, XVII, 55.

Exactly as in the *Quijote*, one book after another is taken out of the pile, examined, discussed and condemned by the examiner. The first one is the then famous *Siegwart*, but at the bottom, "die Grundsuppe," as Andrason calls it, are the most dangerous ones of them all, because, evidently, they are the well-written ones: Rousseau's *Nouvelle Héloïse* and Goethe's *Werther*, just as Cervantes, too, introduces his own *Galatea* among the guilty books. Andrason wants to burn them all, "ohne Barmherzigkeit." But, as his own wife is the woman whom the prince loves, the king decides not to destroy the chief instruments of the other's madness, so that his estranged wife might recognize her own folly. Once more the importance of the influence of books that can bewitch is stated here:

Ist es nicht deutlich, meine schönen Kinder, dass in diesen Papieren eine Art von Talisman steckt; dass in ihnen diese magische Gewalt liegt, die den Prinzen an eine abgeschmackte ausgestopfte Puppe fesselt, wozu er die Gestalt von eines ehrlichen Mannes Frau geborgt hat?²

Here the parallelism with the trial of the books in *Don Quijote* ends. But the whole scene, as well in its actions as in its programmatic purpose, seems to be a direct echo from Cervantes.

We know that Goethe began the dictation of this play in 1777. Less than two years before, Bertuch's translation of the *Quijote* had appeared, the reading of which must have been fresh in Goethe's mind. His various later remarks on Cervantes' novel testify to his familiarity with and interest in the work.

WERNER VORDTRIEDE

Princeton University

DONNE'S PHOENIX

In the "Marriage Song" written in 1613 for Princess Elizabeth, Donne repeats a conventional group of amorous images that he had used in "The Canonization" with a new emphasis.

For thou this day couplest two Phoenixes;
 Thou mak'st a Taper see
 What the sunne never saw, and what the Arke
 (Which was of soules, and beasts, the cage, and park,)
 Did not contain. . . .

² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Modern editors have not commented on this passage, because we have lost track of the controversy that lies behind these lines. If, however, one reads this section in the light of 1640, one gets a very different poetic reaction than the average modern reader is likely to have.

The phoenix was such an excellent symbol of the Resurrection that Church fathers like Clement, Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyprian, and others were inclined to believe in the reality of that fabulous bird in spite of the adverse testimony of rational pagans like Pliny. But this posed a problem; for if the phoenix existed, it had to be included in Noah's aviary. The Genesis story, however, said that the birds were admitted in pairs. There was the rub. This was a problem for the exegetes, who busied themselves with such burning matters as whether or not insects, satyrs, merefolk, vultures, birds of paradise, and other zoologicals were in the Ark's waftage, and they gave it their full attention.

Donne was by no means unaware of the activities of these men. He begins his "To Sr Edward Herbert"¹ with a parallel passage clipped from the commentaries on the Flood, and there are other similar allusions in the *First Anniversary*² and *The Progresse of the Soule*.³ The theological glosses likewise give us the key to Donne's stand on the phoenix, for by this time the exegetes had decided that the phoenix was not on the Ark. Pererius writes that some have said that the phoenix could not be taken on the Ark because of its "ambisexerity" and that, as a consequence, it perished in the Flood. He, however, does not believe that the bird ever existed.⁴ Cornelius a Lapide, Drayton's favorite commentator, comes to the same conclusion—"phoenicem non esse, nec fuisse in mundo."⁵ J. C. Scaliger had previously upset matters by asserting that the phoenix was the Indian⁶ Semenda; but when Aldrovandus, the great encyclopaedist of science, issued his folio on birds, he attacked Scaliger's assertion and denied that the phoenix

¹ *Poetical works* (Grierson, Oxford, 1912), I, 193.

² Lines, 317-8.

³ Lines, 9, 21-30.

⁴ *Commentarii et disputationes in Genesim* (Lugduni, 1607-10), II, 205-9.

⁵ *Commentaria in Pentateuchum Mosis* (Antverpiae, 1630), p. 113; see also Jacobus Bonfrerius, *Pentateuchum Moysis, commentario illustratus* (Antverpiae, 1625), p. 151.

⁶ *Exotericarum exercitationum liber XV* (Francofurti, 1612), p. 731.

had ever been on the Ark.⁷ After the great authority had expressed himself, no theologian, and certainly not John Donne, felt able to support the discredited patristic position.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

SUR DEUX ADDITIONS FAITES PAR ROUSSEAU À SON PREMIER DISCOURS

Dans la préface du *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, Rousseau a dit qu'il avait 'laissé deux additions faciles à reconnoître, et que l'Académie n'auroit peut-être pas approuvées.'¹ Mais on se demande encore quelles sont ces additions,² et l'on a fait trois hypothèses à leur sujet. S'agit-il d'un passage où Rousseau fait une référence³ aux *Pensées philosophiques* de Diderot? Est-ce celui où il parle de 'l'inégalité funeste introduite entre les hommes'? Ou bien est-ce la phrase qui mentionne la ruine⁴ de la Maison de Bourgogne? Mr. Havens, qui propose cette solution, croit qu'il est possible que Rousseau ait 'hésité à soumettre ce passage à l'Académie de Dijon, en pleine Bourgogne.' Mais le sentiment particulariste de la Bourgogne n'était, pourtant, pas assez vif, au XVIII^e siècle, pour que les habitants de cette province, rattachée à la France depuis la fin du XV^e siècle, ne pussent se réjouir de la défaite de Charles le Téméraire, à Granson et à Morat. Mais, ce qui aurait pu déplaire à l'Académie de Dijon, c'était l'éloge des Suisses, et, justement, Rousseau avait dû tenir à rappeler une des plus célèbres victoires de ses compatriotes. Nous retiendrons donc l'hypothèse de Mr. Havens, mais pour une raison différente de celle qu'il propose. Quant à l'autre addition faite par Rousseau, ne serait-ce pas la phrase suivante: 'Telle enfin s'est montrée jusqu'à nos jours cette nation rustique si vantée pour son courage que l'adversité n'a pu

⁷ *Ornithologiae, hoc est, de avibus historiae, libri XVIII* (Francofurti, 1610), I, 403-4, 410.

¹ J.-J. Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, éd. George R. Havens (New York, 1946), p. 95.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176, n. 40.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 235-236, n. 252.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

abbatre, et pour sa fidélité que l'exemple n'a pu corrompre.'⁵ On lit cette allusion à la Suisse,⁶ avec un peu de surprise. Rousseau venait de parler des Perses, des Scythes, des Germains et de Rome. Il s'était inspiré des témoignages des Anciens, et l'on s'attend mal, après cela, à l'éloge de la Suisse. On a l'impression que Rousseau a ajouté l'exemple de sa patrie, après coup. Les deux additions⁷ qu'a faites Rousseau, au moment où il commence de penser à sa 'réforme,' seraient donc celles qui se rapportent à son pays natal.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

THE PUBLICATION OF HANNAH MORE'S FIRST PLAY

Although Hannah More's *A Search After Happiness*, three verse-dialogues in the form of a pastoral, is generally conceded to be her earliest work, the date of its initial publication has been in doubt.¹ This uncertainty would appear to be wiped out in a letter written November 8, 1773, by William Eddis, surveyor of customs at Annapolis:

I have lately received a very sensible, and very entertaining letter, from my valued correspondent, Miss M—— M——, who informs me that her sister H—— has, at length, complied with the requisition of many judicious and impartial friends, and has ventured into public notice, in defiance of criticism. On the 10th of May last, her pastoral poem, 'THE SEARCH AFTER HAPPINESS,' made its first appearance; and so rapid has been its success, that a second large impression took place early in August.²

CHESTER L. SHAVER

Oberlin College

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 198-199, n. 131.

⁷ Mr. Havens a, d'ailleurs, fort pertinemment rapproché les deux passages du *Premier Discours* dans lesquels Rousseau parle de la Suisse.

¹ See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, XLIII (July, 1773), 342, *The Monthly Review*, XLIX (September, 1773), 202, and *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*.

² *Letters from America . . .* by William Eddis (London, 1792), pp. 153-4. Eddis probably received his information from Hannah's sister Martha. A list of subscribers prefixed to his book includes the names of "Miss Hannah More, Bath" and "Miss Martha More, ditto."

WORDSWORTH'S DEBT TO THOMAS NEWTON

To illustrate his view in the *Preface* of 1815 that one function of the poet's imagination is to consolidate "numbers into unity," Wordsworth analyses Milton's comparison of Satan to a fleet of merchantmen. In the course of his remarks he says:

'So seemed,' and to whom seemed? To the heavenly Muse who dictates the poem, and to the eye of the Poet's mind, and to that of the Reader, present at one moment in the wide Ethiopian, and the next in the solitudes, then first broken in upon, of the infernal regions.

Commenting more than half a century earlier on "so seemed," Milton's editor, Thomas Newton, had written:

Dr. Bentley asks, whom Satan appeared to *far off*, in this his *solitary flight*? But what a cold phlegmatick piece of criticism is this? It may be answered, that he was seen by the Muse, and would have seemed so to any one who had seen him. Poets often speak in this manner, and make themselves and their readers present to the most remote and retired scenes of action.¹

That Wordsworth was acquainted with Newton's note seems fairly probable. In the light of Newton's final sentence, moreover, it is not surprising that Wordsworth should have clinched his own discussion of the simile with Horace's "*Modo me Thebis, modo ponit Athenis.*"

CHESTER L. SHAVER

Oberlin College

¹ Quoted in H. J. Todd, *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (London, 1801), III, 138. Newton's observations on Milton's choice of a fleet instead of a ship are worth comparing with Wordsworth's discussion of the point in his letter to Sir George Beaumont written August 28, 1811.

REVIEWS

Essai sur le Journal de Voyage de Montaigne. Par CHARLES DÉDÉYAN. Paris: Boivin [1946]. Pp. 218.

L'Influence du voyage de Montaigne sur les Essais. Par IMBRIE BUFFUM. Dissertation. Princeton University, 1946. Pp. viii + 153.

Montaigne chez ses amis anglo-saxons. Par CHARLES DÉDÉYAN. 2 v. Paris: Boivin [1946]. Pp. 448 + 118.

One of the many results of the war has been the separation of scholars and duplication of effort in the field of learning. It is quite possible that one of the two books devoted to Montaigne's *Journal* would not have been written if the author had known that the other was to be published in the same year. Both authors relate the circumstances under which the *Journal* was composed, stored away for nearly two centuries, discovered, identified, and printed. M. Dédéyan gives in greater detail the reasons for considering it an authentic document and lists a few French editions that Dr. Buffum, writing in America, was unable to cite, but otherwise this part of the two books is very much the same. However, there are considerable differences elsewhere, for D. discusses the style of the *Journal*; following D'Ancona and Lautrey, studies its barbarous Italian; gives more comments upon it by later writers; and adds somewhat superfluous chapters on other French travelers in Italy. B., on the other hand, goes more thoroughly into the question of the influence exerted by the trip upon the composition of the *Essais*, that is, upon Book III and the additions to Books I and II.¹

Both point out in the *Essais* a number of undeniable allusions to experiences of the trip, most of them recorded in the *Journal*. Both go much farther than this, attributing to the trip a very considerable influence upon Montaigne's opinions. According to B., the "voyage" developed Montaigne's attitude toward physical pain, toward death, toward social life, toward his acceptance of every individual as a sample of humanity, toward his trust in his own experiences. He writes (p. 139):

Si les passages à la louange de la coutume et de la société deviennent bien plus nombreux après le voyage, le cas est encore plus frappant en ce qui concerne l'idée de l'unité de la nature humaine, idée qui ne paraît jamais avant le voyage, et qui est ajoutée aux *Essais* pour la première fois

¹ Since D. dedicates his book to Georges Duhamel, it may be well that he emphasizes less than B. Montaigne's interest in mechanical devices.

dans l'édition de 1582. Il est donc permis de croire que le voyage contribua à fixer la forme que revêtit en dernier lieu sa pensée philosophique, et sa conception du monde et des hommes.

D. also stresses the importance of his travels (p. 151):

Le voyage a donc cette conséquence en apparence paradoxale de le faire, une fois sorti de lui-même, rentrer en lui-même, en lui montrant que le monde ne peut fournir à notre expérience que des renseignements négatifs et ne lui prouvant l'absence qu'il soupçonnait déjà d'une vérité unique. Le profit accessoire qu'il a pu tirer de ses pérégrinations, il l'a éparpillé tout au long des *Essais*.

Now Vols. I and II of the *Essais* were first published in 1580; the trip lasted from June 22 of that year to Nov. 30, 1581; the 2nd edition appeared in 1582; the third book in 1588. One would expect to find the influence of the trip especially in the additions made in 1582 to Books I and II, but it is much stronger, according to both D. and B., in Book III, in the additions made in 1588 to the earlier Books, and in the further marginal additions that Montaigne made in the Bordeaux copy. However, before 1588 Montaigne had been Mayor of Bordeaux, had had the experience of the plague, had witnessed the intensification of civil war. How can one tell whether it was the trip to Switzerland, Germany, and Italy rather than his administrative life and the events of 1582-8 that made most of the difference between his earlier and his later work? Even if he had never passed the borders of his country, tendencies expressed in *Amilié*, *Institution des enfans*, *Cannibales*, and other essays might well have developed into those of Book III. His enlightened attitude towards the Turks,² for instance, was not due to a visit to their country. He referred to the "calessons de la signora Livia," as D. shows (p. 127), before he went to Rome or called upon her colleagues. One must take into consideration the success of Books I and II in estimating Montaigne's reasons for giving a more ample portrait of himself in Book III. And the account given in the *Journal* of his leaving a silver votive offering at the shrine of the Virgin at Loretta does not fit very well with the Montaigne that we meet in the *Essais*. That the trip furnished him with certain illustrations no one can deny, that it may have strengthened his ideas about the unity of mankind is highly probable, but to the question whether or not it had the fundamental importance attributed to it by B. and D., Montaigne himself would probably have answered, "Que sais-je?"

Neither writer seeks to make of the *Journal* a literary masterpiece. D. admits (p. 160) that the style is "négligé et incorrect" and that there are "presque pas d'images," but he attributes to it a rich vocabulary and a few passages that recall the *Essais*. After

² Cf. C. D. Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature*, Paris, Boivin, 1940, pp. 369-76.

all, we are interested in Montaigne because of the *Essais*; in the *Journal* because of Montaigne.³

D.'s two-volume work is devoted to the reception accorded the *Essais* and the *Journal* in Great Britain and in New England. It should make a companion volume to A. M. Boase's *Fortunes of Montaigne, a History of the Essays in France, 1580-1669*, but D. goes much farther than Boase, studying as recent writers as Stevenson and Pater. He shows that Walpole and others resented Montaigne's concentration upon himself; Carlyle and others, his *gauloiseries*; but that he won admiration from Goldsmith, Sterne, Gibbon, Byron, Hazlitt, Thackeray, etc., as well as from Emerson and Lowell. It is difficult, of course, to establish the question of influence,⁴ but D. makes it clear that Montaigne was generally recognized as the father of the essay, that the *Essais*, like the Bible, was often regarded as an English classic, and that the work may well have broadened many an Englishman's interest in humanity and encouraged in him a conversational style. John Sterling and Bayle St. John even went on pilgrimages to Montaigne's château. John M. Robertson wrote of him: "Of all essayists who have yet written, he is the most transparent, the most discursive, the most free-tongued, and therefore the most alive."⁵

When someone in the twenty-first century carries the fortunes of Montaigne down to the middle of the twentieth, he will be obliged to list D.'s three volumes and B.'s dissertation. He will note in them their authors' intense admiration for the Gascon and the extensive inquiry they have made into the question of how he came to write as he did. He will be impressed, too, by the still more

³ I cannot agree with D. (p. 38) that, if Montaigne had been "plus jeune et plus valide," he would have embarked with Jacques Cartier pour le Canada ou avec sir Walter Raleigh pour la Virginie," for he was only nine when Cartier returned from his last voyage to America, and Raleigh never sailed for Virginia. P. 52, for l'Aristote read l'Arioste. B. (p. 140) states that the part of the *Journal* written by the secretary "parle toujours de Montaigne à la troisième personne," but D. denies this and shows (p. 16) that the *je* of "je fus là averti d'une sottise que j'avois faite" refers to Montaigne, not to the secretary. P. 141, B. gives the first edition of the *Journal* that appeared as part of the *Œuvres* of Montaigne as that of Buchon, Paris, Lefèvre, 1836. The only edition made by Buchon that D. cites is that of Paris, Desrey, 1837, but he lists editions of the *Œuvres* containing the *Journal* as published at Paris by Lefèvre in 1818 (reprinted, 1823) and 1826-9.

⁴ I would not, as D. does (p. 123), consider Montaigne the source of Byron's commonplace remark that no one is a great man to his valet merely because the idea is expressed in the *Essais*.

⁵ Cited by D., II, 86. This second volume consists of extracts from Florio, Bouhier, Hazlitt, Henry Hallam, Fitzgerald, etc. The quotations in Vol. I are given in French translation, usually with the English in a foot-note. Most of these translations are accurate, but I would not translate "put everybody right" (I, 402) by "mettre chacun exactement à sa place." P. 399, approval is given for the statement that Robert Louis Stevenson always wrote for "les jeunes filles et les enfants." I wonder for which of these categories he composed *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

elaborate inquiry that D. has made in the field of literary relations between the French and the English, and by the fact that, despite the presence of their common enemy, the manuscript was completed at Rennes in December, 1943.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The Johns Hopkins University

Alessandro Manzoni: Esthetics and Literary Criticism. By JOSEPH FRANCIS DE SIMONE. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1946. Pp. 429.

Alessandro Manzoni does not rank very high in the history of Italian literary criticism. He never professed literary criticism, on only few occasions did he undertake the discussion of theoretical problems, and very seldom, and very reluctantly, did he express his opinion on individual writers. Nevertheless his views on literature have attracted the attention of leading Italian critics from De Sanctis to the contemporary Croce, Momigliano, and Galletti, both because he was the acknowledged leader of Italian romanticists and, especially, because of the lofty position he occupies in the realm of Italian letters.

Prof. De Simone's book is a welcome addition to this literature because it is the most extensive and systematic treatment of the subject. The work consists of two parts. The first summarizes and integrates the partial studies already published on Manzoni's esthetics. The second, and much more voluminous part, collects and organizes the literary judgments which Manzoni left in his published works or expressed privately in conversation with friends and were later disclosed by Cantù, Tommaseo, Stampa, Fabris, and Borra. These judgments, with careful analyses and elucidations by De Simone, are arranged according to the nationality of the writers discussed and in chronological sequence for each nation, thus presenting in convenient form what Manzoni said about several national literatures,—Greek and Roman, Italian, French, English, German, and Spanish.

In the first part Prof. De Simone does a competent job discussing the evolution of the esthetic ideas of Manzoni in his search for a form combining the morally good, the historically true, and the esthetically beautiful. This evolution is traced from the groping of the juvenile period, when Manzoni adhered to classicism and 18th century rationalism; through the period of the religious and literary "conversion," when he created his narrative masterpiece *I Promessi Sposi* as well as his great lyrical and dramatic works; to the final and longest period of his life, that of renunciation and negation of art, when he abandoned creative literature, and turned

his attention to linguistic and historical problems. Prof. De Simone stresses, and rightly so, the essential unity and consistency of Manzoni's mind, showing that there is no break between the periods, and no insoluble contradiction between what he thought in his youth and what he thought in his maturity. This viewpoint is not new,—nor does De Simone claim that it is,—but its presentation is very elaborate and well organized and documented.

The second part,—the discussion of Manzoni's literary criticism,—is less fortunate. The literary opinions which Manzoni expressed on individual writers are too few and too short to supply any sort of basis for a judgment on Manzoni as a critic. Since Manzoni left only some passing references, some chance remarks, and in some cases was even completely silent, on the majority of the writers discussed, Prof. De Simone is forced to supplement the scanty material with surmises, hypotheses, comparisons or contrasts between Manzoni and the writer under consideration. Although Manzoni never mentioned Chateaubriand and Leopardi, De Simone devotes five pages to Chateaubriand and no less than fourteen to Leopardi. His discussions are interesting, some of them quite acute, but they hardly have any bearing on Manzoni's literary criticism. Furthermore in most cases Manzoni did not attempt to pass comprehensive judgments, but expressed himself only on some trait of the writer's character or thought,—as is the case for his unfavorable remarks on Dante, Boccaccio, Ariosto, Tasso, Alfieri, and many others. It is not fair to Manzoni's taste and intelligence to suppose that those remarks fully state his critical views. What Manzoni really thought we do not know because he did not choose to say, but it is safe to assume that his judgments would have been less biased and one-sided if he had turned his attention to the totality of the works of the writers mentioned. An example of this are his observations on Machiavelli whose works he discussed with equanimity and acumen, although he emphatically rejected Machiavelli's main principles. The fact is that Manzoni never was nor tried to be a literary critic, and he is definitely out of character when this role is forced on him on the basis of a few and unrelated utterances.

Prof. De Simone is fully aware of these difficulties. He repeatedly calls attention to the paucity and incompleteness of Manzoni's critical judgments. He realizes that "Manzoni's literary criticism adds little that is new to the study of those works analyzed and examined by him" (p. 420), but he feels his work is justified because "the literary judgments . . . discussed in the second part of this work are extremely valuable for the understanding of Manzoni himself. They complete our picture of him as a great spiritual unity." (p. 421). That is true, provided we keep constantly in mind that most of the judgments reported were expressed in the third period of Manzoni's life, when his attitude toward literature was negative, and so, naturally enough, was his opinion on most individual writers.

Perhaps it would have been better to use these judgments on writers and works in the discussion of Manzoni's *Esthetics*, as illustrations of statements of theoretical principles, rather than to devote a whole, and altogether too long, section of the book to them. The work would have gained in conciseness and clarity, and would have given a truer exposition of Manzoni's thought. But even as it stands the book is good. It is clearly the result of wide reading and serious thinking. The material collected is certainly very useful, whether one likes its organization or not. For these reasons Prof. De Simone's book is a study that students of Manzoni can ill afford to ignore.

JOSEPH ROSSI

University of Wisconsin

The Meditations of Daniel Defoe. Now First Printed. Edited by GEORGE HARRIS HEALEY. Cummington, Mass.: Cummington Press, 1946. Pp. x + 26. \$7.50.

A half century ago Karl Bülbring published a manuscript Defoe had left unfinished at his death. Mr. George Healey, recently captain in the USAAF, now publishes what are probably the earliest compositions by Defoe we shall ever have. They are from a notebook which passed from Defoe's daughters to their minister, Dr. J. Duncan of Wimborne in Dorsetshire. Over a century ago Walter Wilson looked in vain for it. Mr. Healey turns it up in the Huntington Library, where it has been for two decades or so.

The notebook consists of 195 pages, largely filled with Defoe's transcript of six, in a series of seven, sermons preached by John Collins in 1681, but having at the end, in twenty-three pages, seven verse meditations of Defoe's own composition. Mr. Healey finds the sermons dull and prints only the meditations, duplicating page by page the manuscript as nearly as possible. The edition

is limited to 280 copies printed from Poliphilus and Blado types, thirty copies on Georgian paper being for review, the rest, numbered 1 to 250 and on Tuscany handmade paper, being mostly for sale.

In so ornate a volume, Mr. Healey might have reproduced for us one of the notebook's handsome pages in which, he says, the script, though characteristically Defoe's, has a

flowery, self-conscious, almost schoolboyish quality, constantly reminding us that this is a much younger Defoe than the one whose writings we know best.

The sermons appear to have been transcribed at the time of their delivery in 1681, and the verses to have been written not long after-

ward. The first page of the verses is in heroic couplets, and another page, containing the whole of the sixth meditation, is in what hymnbooks call short meter. All the rest is in irregular stanzas, which are better suited than couplets to introspection. Few will disagree with Mr. Healey in regarding the chief importance of the meditations as biographical. They reveal an earnest youth of less poetical genius than piety, who had just decided (or had he?) not to enter the ministry. The following stanza from the first meditation, in which lines 5-7 at least echo earlier religious lyrics of the century, illustrates the subjectivity of the meditations.

Chiefly I come,
(Ah That I were at home!)
From all That Gawdy Righteousness of Myne,
To Dress in That New Robe of Thyne.
And From My Self,
That Fatall Shelf,
On which my Soul Would Splitt & Drown,
Lord I Have Nothing of My Owne!

Mr. Healey recognizes that the transcript of sermons, too, has biographical value. What Defoe was doing in the five years following school we do not know. The usual assumption has been that he served an apprenticeship to a merchant and that he traveled on the continent. Dottin, citing neither reason nor authority, positively identified the merchant as Charles Lodwick, who in December, 1683, sponsored Defoe's application for a marriage license.¹ He then supposes that Defoe finished his apprenticeship in time to make a continental tour in 1680-82 with a group of merchant-travellers. Professor Sutherland accepts Defoe's vigorous denial that he had been an apprentice and thinks that Defoe must have become a merchant by 1680. But he says nothing of Dottin's statement about Lodwick.²

This is the uncertain period into which Mr. Healey now projects the information that from February to September and later in 1681 Defoe was listening to sermons delivered in London by John Collins. The evidence for London is stronger than Mr. Healey recognizes. Mr. John Collins, D. D., was at the time minister of an Independent congregation in Paved Alley, Lime Street,³ and one of six distinguished lecturers (four Presbyterians and two Inde-

¹ Paul Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans* (1924), I, 29, 47; G. A. Aitken, "Defoe's Birth and Marriage" in the *Athenæum*, II (1890), 257. Dottin suggested that Defoe was employed as a comrade for Lodwick's son, Thomas.

² James R. Sutherland, *Defoe* (1937), pp. ix, 28.

³ Collins succeeded Thomas Malory upon the latter's death in 1668 or 1669 and served till his own death in 1687, when Nathaniel Mather, brother of Increase Mather, became the minister. See A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), articles on Collins, Malory, and Mather; John Langdon Sibley, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University*, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1873), 186 ff.

pendents) who took turns on Tuesday mornings in Pinners' Hall, supporting "the doctrines of the Reformation against the prevailing errors of Popery, Socinianism and Infidelity."⁴ On 28 November and 12 December, 1681, about the time the sermons Defoe was transcribing were concluded, Collins was being cited with Annesley, Calamy, and others for violating the Uniformity, Conventicle, and Five Mile Acts.⁵ He had collaborated with the Presbyterians in the Savoy conference in 1661 and was greatly respected by all dissenters, who would have been surprised to hear his sermons called dull.⁶

The six sermons Defoe dated as follows: 20 February, 1680 [1681], 26 March, 15 May, 12 June, 10 July (Defoe missed this sermon), 25 September, and (for the seventh of the series and the sixth heard by Defoe) a time unspecified. Since they were all upon the same text (*Mark* 16: 15-16, "Go ye into all the world") and came several weeks apart, they may have been a series delivered elsewhere than in Collins's own pulpit.⁷ They could not have been Pinners' Hall lectures, for they are not controversial and they were not delivered on Tuesdays. All were Sunday sermons, unless the date given for the second is correct; 26 March, 1681, was a Saturday. However this may be, the dates support my warning that Defoe may have seen less of the continent than Dottin supposed;⁸ and they do not contradict Professor Sutherland's suggestion that Defoe had already set up in business for himself.

ARTHUR SECORD

University of Illinois

Jean Paul und die Schweiz, von EDUARD BEREND. Frauenfeld/Leipzig: Verlag von Huber and Co. [1943]. Pp. 131.

Although Jean Paul like Schiller never visited Switzerland, his works exhibit, as do Schiller's, an intimate knowledge of Swiss life and scenery. When Jean Paul salutes the Swiss Alps as the seat of "the invisible temples of freedom and religion," he is voicing a sentiment not alien to Schiller's viewpoint.

It is indeed fortunate for Jean Paul and the Swiss people that the

⁴ Daniel Neal, *History of the Puritans* (1733), iv, 451.

⁵ *Cal. S. P. (dom. ser.)*, 1680-1681 (1921), pp. 592, 613.

⁶ Daniel Neal (*Hist. of the Puritans*, iv, 580) says that Collins had a sweet voice and a most affectionate manner in the pulpit, that he was "mighty in the scriptures," and that he died universally lamented. But having read his "farewell" sermon of 1662 (*Farewel Sermons*, 1663, p. 305), I accept Mr. Healey's verdict upon the sermons of 1681.

⁷ Otherwise how came Defoe to transcribe none of the intervening sermons on other texts?

⁸ A. W. Secord, review of Miss Ragan's translation of Dottin's biography, *JEGP*, xxx (1931), 298.

course of this mutual interest has come under the discerning eye of the greatest living authority on Jean Paul. Forced by the exigencies of the war to take up his residence as an exile in Switzerland, Eduard Berend has, amid the most harrowing and distracting experiences, traced with infinite care and admirable balance the record of Jean Paul's connection with the Swiss people and their literature. Only one so conversant with Jean Paul's life and works as Eduard Berend could, in the compass of so small a volume, evoke so complete a picture of this relationship.

The book is appropriately dedicated to the Swiss scholar, Albert Béguin, who both by his excellent translations of *Hesperus* and *Jubelseniör* into French (a not inconsiderable achievement) and by his critical studies has done so much to reveal Jean Paul to a larger public.

An opening chapter recounts how great and persistent was Jean Paul's longing to see the Alpine countries. Visits to Stuttgart and Munich represent the nearest he came to its realization. Successive chapters discuss Switzerland as reflected in his works, his personal connections with Swiss people, his knowledge and judgment of Swiss writers, and finally the reception and effect of Jean Paul's writings on the Swiss.

His knowledge of the Swiss country was gained largely through books of travel of which he was a voracious reader, poetic works of Haller and Gessner, Schiller's *Tell*, Baggesen's *Parthenäis*, and the historical writings of Johannes Müller.

The longest and in certain respects the most interesting of these chapters treats of Jean Paul's acquaintance with Swiss people. Some of these, like Heinrich Zschokke, he met personally in Bayreuth; some were not Swiss but enthusiastic admirers of the Swiss people, like Juliana Krüdner, who repeatedly urged him to join her on a trip to Switzerland; others, he knew only through correspondence, for example Lavater whose letters appear here for the first time. Sometimes the connection is only indirectly through the medium of friends, as for instance Pestalozzi.

One of the most original of these acquaintances fostered by correspondence is a representative not from Swiss literary circles but from the people, an honest, sturdy character, Mummenthaler by name. As an indication of Jean Paul's popular appeal, these letters are significant. The friendship was sealed at its inception by a gift to Jean Paul of a huge Emmenthaler cheese. Cheeses are a recurrent matter of comment in these letters, which in other respects reveal an exceptional familiarity with Jean Paul's works even to the extent of imitating his style of humor.

His debt to Swiss literature is treated somewhat at length. He was not particularly interested in Bodmer and Breitinger, but in the Swiss literature of the second half of the 18th century he was thoroughly at home. Haller was a favorite writer. He was espe-

cially attracted to his political novels, particularly *Usong* and of course *Die Alpen*. Haller's scientific works, particularly the eight volume edition of the *Physiologie*, claimed much of his attention. It is interesting to note that his devotion to Swift and to Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* was furthered largely by the translation of these works by Heinrich Waser of Zürich. Jean Paul's own style at one time, as Berend points out, was largely influenced by these translations. Salomon Gessner also was an early favorite of Jean Paul. However, in Goethe's *Jery und Bätely* he finds more Swiss local color than in half the works of Gessner.

The influence of Jean Jacques Rousseau is so pervasive in Jean Paul's work and so well recognized that the pages devoted to him in this little volume are confirmative rather than informative. Of Madame de Staël, Jean Paul had expressed himself at length in the pages of the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*. Berend, however, brings the main aspect of this relationship into focus and illuminates the salient features of this connection with apt comment. Since the first non-German critical survey of Jean Paul's position in the literature of the time came from Madame de Staël, these pages are of great interest.

It is an ingratiating little volume written *con amore* and disclosing vistas of still unexplored territory for further study.

EDWARD VERE BREWER

University of California

Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Gesammelte Werke in zwölf Einzelausgaben: Die Erzählungen. Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer Verlag, 1945. 461 pages, \$3.75.

It has been reported that the French people during the years of their national misfortune turned with an increased fervor to the study of their classical authors. If the same thing happens to the Germans now, the edition which the present volume inaugurates can be of great importance. It will show to the readers that Hofmannsthal (1874-1929), one of the three great German poets of the past generation, can claim a place among German classics. This new edition is planned in 12 volumes. It will contain all the works of Hofmannsthal published so far: to the *Gesammelte Werke* of 1924 in six volumes (reprinted with addition of the second version of *Der Turm* in 1934 in three thick volumes) it will add the more recent operas, the essays, some published in 1931 as *Die Berührung der Sphären*, some never collected, the pantomimes and other minor works for the stage, and above all, the various publications, in rare editions and in periodicals, of the fragmentary material left by the poet: rejected works, fragments of stories and

plays, projects, and a wealth of notes and ideas. In order, however, to present a complete picture of Hofmannsthal, this edition will have to be supplemented in two directions. First, the poet's letters will not be included in the new edition. With a few exceptions, the letters have been published only to the year 1910. (One of Hofmannsthal's closest friends during the last ten years of his life has recently made known some valuable excerpts of letters: Carl J. Burckhardt, *Erinnerungen an Hofmannsthal*, Verlag Benno Schwabe Co., Klosterberg, Basel, 1944.) Second, there will remain still unpublished fragments and notes which, according to the editor, would fill four more volumes. The editor is Herbert Steiner, who has enriched German letters by directing the review *Corona* (1930-1940), and has now started a periodical above language boundaries: *Mesa* (printed at Aurora, N. Y.).

The picture of Hofmannsthal that will result from this new edition will be a new and more definite one than the old picture of 30 years ago of the "aesthete," and the more recent notion of the ethical poet worked out by Grete Schaeder, Brecht, Krueger, Naef, Alewyn, and others. Even this first volume of narrative prose impresses the reader with three features that were before not as obvious. In the first place, there is in the narratives the predominance of an Oriental atmosphere. German poetry has received Oriental influences, but almost exclusively as transmitted forms, in the lyrics of Goethe, Platen, Rückert. But the Orient of 1001 Nights as a dream content, as the breathing space of a poetic imagination, has hardly been important in German letters before the narratives of this Viennese poet, who considered Venice, an Orient transferred into the Occident, the most beautiful city that he knew. The second characteristic that strikes the reader is the number of fragments, about equal to the number of finished works. One could almost speak of an attraction, of a charm that the fragmentary nature of a work exerts on Hofmannsthal's mind. He finds in a fragment the deep, stimulating, exciting, sudden flash of insight, which only the fragmentary state preserves in its elementary immediacy. This the art lover of today, who often prefers the drawing of a master for the same reason, will understand. This aspect of Hofmannsthal's work will be brought out more clearly in the volume of the notebooks (*Aufzeichnungen*), which belong to the most stimulating products of recent German letters, comparable to the aperçus of Paul Valéry. In the third place, the unity of Hofmannsthal's work is impressed upon the reader by the new edition. "The end is woven back into the beginning," as we read in one of the stories. It might often be hard to tell, except by a close analysis of style, which piece was written in early life and which in his last years. The personal development of the poet is of little importance. His themes, and even his language, were at his disposal from the very beginning. They were only enlarged by a growing awareness of the needs of his time and his nation.

His life and mind were secure in a historical and intellectual tradition, a phenomenon common enough among French or English writers, but unusual among Germans, who have not been favored in this respect either by circumstances or their own natures. Therefore, in the eyes of a German, Hofmannsthal's person and work seem to offer a spiritual shelter, a promise that the German mind can attain unity.

WALTER NAUMANN

Oberlin College

Examen des remarques de Racine sur l'Odyssée d'Homère écrites à Uzès en 1662. Par GASTON-E. BROCHE. Paris, Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie et imprimerie Marc Texier réunies, 1946. Pp. xiii + 123.

Méridional, secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie Racinienne et amateur d'Homère ayant suivi, sur la Méditerranée, les traces géographiques d'Ulysse, M. Broche réunit les trois qualités qui, de son propre aveu (pp. xi-xii), étaient nécessaires pour étudier avec fruit le cahier contenant les remarques de Racine sur l'*Odyssée*. Ce cahier est un de ces textes antérieurs à la *Thébaïde* que l'on lit rarement, mais qui n'en sont pas moins indispensables à l'étude et à la compréhension de la formation littéraire de Racine: correspondance d'Uzès, *Remarques sur les Olympiques de Pindare* et livres annotés, parmi lesquels on trouve ces notes de Racine à la *Poétique* d'Aristote que M. Vinaver a récemment rééditées et commentées.

M. Broche étudie l'un après l'autre les dix premiers chants de l'*Odyssée* commentés par Racine et répartit ses 82 observations en quatre rubriques: I, bonnes remarques; II, remarques médiocres; III, lacunes; IV, remarques diverses. Méthode assurément minutieuse, mais trop exclusivement analytique et qui s'abstient de regrouper les remarques fragmentaires de Racine, d'autant plus que le livre ne comporte pas de conclusion.

Cependant l'auteur met en lumière l'intérêt que présentent plusieurs des scolies du poète. Il montre, par exemple, comment quelques-unes d'entre elles expriment une conception fort peu janséniste des infortunes humaines (pp. 5-6, 105-107). Il faudrait ajouter à cela que certaines des notes de Racine en marge de Platon ou de Plutarque,—antérieures, il est vrai, de plusieurs années,—révèlent une attitude précisément opposée. M. Broche souligne ailleurs (pp. 25-26, 48-50, 71-73) la manière plus poétique qu'ecclésiastique dont Racine réagit devant certaines des héroïnes épiques, attitude que confirme la lecture de ses lettres à Vitart ou à Le Vasseur. Il met très justement en valeur (pp. 46-47) le commentaire que fait Racine de quelques vers de l'*Odyssée* (Δ , 12-14),

commentaire résumant de manière significative le thème de la future *Andromaque*. On pourrait ajouter qu'en marge de la Vème *Néméenne* de Pindare (Mesnard, VI, 217), Racine fait un commentaire qui résume déjà le thème théorique de *Phèdre*. D'autres remarques montrent l'attitude de Racine devant la composition de l'épopée (pp. 39-40, 57-58, 85), son admiration pour une préparation à longue échéance d'Homère, technique qu'il admirait chez les tragiques grecs et qu'il perfectionnera dans son propre théâtre. Ailleurs, M. Broche, qui se passionne pour la géographie, nous montre l'ignorance que Racine en avait (pp. 18-19, 40-42, 62-63, 104-105, 107-109, 116-119); puis l'attitude de Racine devant le réalisme pittoresque d'Homère (pp. 9-11, 64-65, 111); devant la psychologie homérique (pp. 7-8, 33-36, 80, 94-95, 98-99); devant la toxicologie (pp. 59-61, 112-113),—affaire des poisons.

Les *Remarques* de Racine présentent cependant d'autres aspects intéressants qui ne ressortent pas de l'étude trop morcelée de M. Broche: notamment l'érudition livresque de Racine, les constants rapprochements que le texte grec lui suggère, avec des auteurs grecs (Platon, Théocrite, Héliodore, etc.), latins (Cicéron, Horace, Ovide, etc.), voire italiens (l'Arioste, le Tasse). A une vingtaine de reprises, il note la manière dont Virgile imite Homère, observation capitale de la part d'un homme qui allait imiter Sophocle et Euripide. Ailleurs (Mesnard, VI, 147-148, 159) Racine discute certaines des assertions d'Homère en faisant intervenir le témoignage d'autres écrivains et se livre à un exercice de critique analogue à celui auquel il s'adonnera dans la préface d'*Iphigénie*.

On ne saurait trop insister, en effet, sur l'importance des lectures que Racine fit à Port-Royal puis à Uzès; et le principal mérite de l'ouvrage de M. Broche est bien de nous montrer, d'une manière malheureusement trop fragmentaire, comment on peut utiliser ces textes critiques de Racine sinon afin de mieux comprendre son génie, du moins afin de mieux évaluer ce que ce génie doit, dans son expression et dans sa forme, à l'éducation littéraire du jeune homme.

GEORGES MAY

Yale University

The Nature of Poetry. By DONALD A. STAUFFER, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1946. Pp. 291. \$3.00.

Mr. Stauffer's able study may suffer in some quarters from its title. It does not, it seems to me, actually advance the theoretical position of modern criticism very much. Though it includes many fresh insights into particular poems, the book is not remarkable for the originality of its critical approach. Rather, it represents a consolidation of ground already gained by the critics of the last twenty

years. This is a service which is of solid value and ought not to be minimized. The consolidation needed to be performed; and it might have been performed poorly or well. Mr. Stauffer's *The Nature of Poetry* performs it very well indeed.

Yet, in saying this, it would be unfair to imply that the book is a mere popularization. The level of writing is too high, the quality of thinking too acute, the mass of concrete material treated too large, to allow one to set the book down as mere popularization. It is a detailed application of the principle of organic structure to a host of concrete examples drawn from the poetry of Chaucer down to that of our own time. If Mr. Stauffer does not push the implications of the principle of organic structure as far as I think they demand to be pushed, he does illustrate the theory convincingly to many people who would probably reject it if presented in a more rigorous form.

Mr. Stauffer, in his search for organizing principles, begins with a commentary upon, and illustration of, the "exactness" of poetry; and he goes on with chapters entitled "Poetry is intense," "significant," "concrete," "complex," "rhythmical," and "formal." For his purpose the method is excellent, and because his comment is consistently tied to concrete examples, the rather pragmatic and loose arrangement of topics does no harm. Such chapters give him means by which to get the reader going into an examination of specific poems. Actually, it seems to me, Mr. Stauffer might have shuffled his chapter topics and got very nearly the same results; or he might indeed have begun with other "unifying principles" such as, for example, poetry is universal, poetry is personal, etc., and got results equally as good. For all of his discussion finally comes to an assertion of the organic nature of poetry.

Occasionally Mr. Stauffer is betrayed into minor contradictions by what I feel is his anxiety to appear catholic and tolerant in his treatment of poetry. For example, in his "Prologue" he suggests that sentimentality can be defended in poetry and that the significance of poetry is "primarily a moral significance." But the chapters that follow show that he knows better than this, and that the "modern critics" from whom he means to dissociate himself in these matters are much closer to his actual position than perhaps he has been aware. Or, to take another example: Mr. Stauffer's hesitance lest he seem dogmatic impels him to write that "the simple and direct statement of an emotion . . . is in itself seldom poetic." But his excellent concluding chapter "Poetry is Formal" implies that poetry is *never* "simple and direct."

Sometimes Mr. Stauffer's examples are not strictly apt. He observes, rightly I believe, that the technique is bad in Keats's "I stood tiptoe upon a little hill." As he puts it: "[The opening line] plunges direct to an extreme." And he goes on to contrast with this opening line that with which Keats begins his "Ode to a Nightingale," "the commonplace statement, 'My heart aches.'" We sense Mr. Stauffer's point; but most of us will feel that "I stood

tiptoe upon a little hill" is a much more *commonplace* and *unemotional* statement than "My heart aches."

But there is very little to quarrel with in the general import of the book. Particular assertions which, taken in isolation, do seem questionable tend to be modified and corrected in the larger context. Moreover, the book abounds in critical statements for which one is grateful: "... it is impossible to fix the significance of any raw material for all artists . . ."; "it is my belief that the nature of poetry is constant . . ."; "Simplification leads to falsification. Allegory, in this light, is hardly more than a start toward poetry"; "Every poem . . . is untranslatable and irreplaceable." Mr. Stauffer is apparently willing to be admirably dogmatic on such points as these. If he is, that is almost enough; for the implications of these statements are immense. Developed and held to, they might go far to rescue the humanities from the morass of sociological relativism into which they have sunk.

CLEANTH BROOKS

Louisiana State University

BRIEF MENTION

Letters of Dora Wordsworth. Edited by HOWARD P. VINCENT. Chicago: Packard and Co., 1944. \$2.00. These letters, written between 1825 and 1832, unfold the story of the friendship of two intelligent young women, Dora Wordsworth and Maria Jane Jewsbury. The letters are interesting, and Mr. Vincent's introduction is useful and unpretentious. The book is pleasant reading. Such criticisms as one feels inclined to make refer solely to the mechanics of editing.

The editor's preface states that he has "tried to be faithful to [the] manuscripts, . . . keeping [their] somewhat erratic spelling," and avoiding "the defensive and tiresome use of *sic*." Any apparent misprint, therefore, is due not to misreading or faulty proof correction but to Dora Wordsworth. Yet it is difficult to be sure. One can credit, for example, that by a slip of the pen Wordsworth wrote "I prefer you prose to your verse" (p. 19) or that his daughter wrote "Wiandermere" (p. 48) and "Fower show" (p. 49), though most readers would prefer to have such slips corrected and the correction acknowledged editorially as concisely as possible. It is less easy, however, to believe that Dora wrote "Korkston" for Kirkstone (p. 24) or the unintelligible "Haotsup" (p. 48), and it is scarcely credible that a northcountryman, on receiving a present of game, would thank the donor for the "boids" (p. 43). The order of the letters is not always right; it is clear from internal evidence that no. 8 should follow, not precede, no. 11.

The letters are printed without indication of writer or recipient

other than they bear in the originals. It is disconcerting, to say the least, to find that the first of "Dora Wordsworth's" letters has no indication of date, no other form of address than "Dear Sir," and is signed "Maria Jane Jewsbury." Then, after the last letter, there come some paragraphs headed by the roman numeral "V"; they are apparently meant to be continuous with the four sections of the introduction. To what extent the editor is to be held responsible is uncertain, but a book which boasts in addition a typographical designer should surely be free from such faults.

R. C. BALD

Cornell University

A Critical History of English Poetry. By H. C. J. GRIERSON and J. C. SMITH. New York: OUP, 1946. Pp. viii + 593. \$5.00. This volume is intended for the "general reader" and hence it should not be judged by the standards that one usually brings to the consideration of histories of literature. The authors are interested only in English poetry and consciously put aside the factual material with which the corpses of dead poets are mummified for eternity. Their purpose is to entice the average literate into the systematic reading of English verse by providing him with a few critical notes on each poet, notes that are illuminated by samples of the poet's own work. The critical observations are often excellent and the hardened reader, even the professional student of literature, will extract a great amount of profit from this book.

D. C. A.

CORRESPONDENCE

PARADISE LOST I, 549-55. That the true source of these lines is the passage in Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* describing the Spartans entering battle to the sound of music was pointed out in *MLN* (January, 1934), by Fred L. Jones. To demonstrate the parallelism he quoted both Milton and Plutarch, using for the latter, however, the Clough translation, based on the so-called Dryden translation. The source was known to Knightly Chetwood, D. D., translator of the *Lycurgus* for Tonson, published (vol. 1) 1683. Proof is found in the superb phrase "deliberate valor," the spirit of free men ready to die for their country, which does not occur in North, at least in the 1603 edition. Milton, writing before 1667, presumably originated the phrase, deriving it from the context of the Greek. Chetwood, discovering the source, with fine judgment employed it.

Thus the source was known sixteen years after publication of *PL*, although thereafter it went unnoted for 251 years.

EDWARD H. GARDNER

Gaylordsville, Connecticut

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Booth, Bradford, ed.—An autobiography by Anthony Trollope. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of Cal. Press, 1947. Pp. xxii + 312. \$3.75.

Hughes, A. M. D.—The nascent mind of Shelley. *Oxford*: OUP, 1947. Pp. 272. 15s.

Leigh, Richard.—Poems, 1675. Introd. by Hugh Macdonald. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1947. Pp. xx + 80. 7/6.

Longworth-Chambrun, Mme.—Shakespeare retrouvé, sa vie, son œuvre. *Paris*: Larousse-Plon, 1947. 494 pp. Fr. 700.

Samuels, Irene.—Plato and Milton. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. xi + 182. \$2.00. (Cornell Studies in English, XXXV).

Shakespeare.—Hamlet, traduit par André Gide. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1946. 239 pp. Fr. 125.

Tindall, William Y.—Forces in modern British literature, 1885-1946. *New York*: Knopf, 1947. Pp. xi + 386 + xviii. \$4.00.

Townsend, Freda L.—Apologie for Bartholmeu Fayre: the art of Jonson's Comedies. *New York and London*: OUP and MLA, 1947. Pp. ix + 102. (Revolving Fund Series xv).

Tuve, Rosemond.—Elizabethan and metaphysical imagery. *Chicago*: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. xiv + 442. \$6.00.

Young, J. P.—Washington Irving à Bordeaux. *Niagara Falls, Ontario*: Author, 871 Simcoe St., 1946. 391 pp.

GERMAN

Bauer, Arnold.—Thomas Mann und die Krise der bürgerlichen Kultur. [Das Transmare-Buch]. *Berlin*: Deu. Buchvertriebs- u. Verlagsges. 1946. 134 pp. M. 4.

Boesch, B.—Deutsche Literaturgeschichte im Grundzügen. Die Epochen deutscher Dichtung in Darstellungen von L. Beriger, A. Bettex, B. Boesch, W. Burkhard, E. Ermatinger, F. Franke, F. Strich, M. Wehrli, A. Zäch herausgegeben. *Bern*: A. Francke, 1946. 363 pp. Fr. 14.80.

Boesch, Bruno.—Untersuchungen zur alemannischen Urkundensprache des 13. Jhs. Laut- und Formenlehre. 203 pp. Fr. 14.50.

Guardini, Romano.—Form und Sinn der Landschaft in den Dichtungen Hölderlins. *Stuttgart*: R. Wunderlich [1946]. 61 pp. M. 3.80.

Lemke, Karl.—Heinrich Mann zu seinem

75. Geburtstag. (1.-10. Tsd.). *Berlin W. 8*: Aufbau Verl. 1946. 71 pp. 1 plate. M.4.50.

Lukacs, Georg.—Deutsche Literatur im Zeitalter des Imperialismus. Eine übersicht ihrer Hauptströmungen. (1.-10. Tsd.). *Berlin*: W. 8: Aufbau-Verl. [1945]. 69 pp. M. 2.40.

Schneider, Reinhold.—Der Dichter vor der Geschichte. Hölderlin/Novalis. 2. Aufl. *Heidelberg*: Kerle, 1946. 68 pp. M. 1.80.

FRENCH

Alberes, R. M.—Saint-Exupéry, essai. *Paris*: La Nouvelle Edition, 1946. 254 pp. Fr. 140.

Arrou, Pierre.—Les Logis de Léon Bloy. *Paris*: Eds. du Myrte, 1946. 159 pp. Fr. 96.

Baudelaire.—One Hundred Poems from *Les Fleurs du mal* translated by C. F. MacIntyre. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1947. xiv + 400 pp. \$5.00.

— Poèmes, éd. G.-Y. Le Dantec. *Paris*: Plon, 1946. ix + 51 pp. Fr. 350.

Béguin, Albert.—Gérard de Nerval. *Paris*: Corti, 1945. 139 pp. Fr. 57.

Bénac, Henri.—Cours de littérature française. 2 v. *Paris*: Ecole des sciences et des arts, 1946.

Benda, Jules.—*Non possumus*, à propos d'une certaine poésie moderne. *Paris*: Eds. de la Nouv. Rev. crit., 1946. 55 pp. Fr. 250.

Boileau.—Satires, éd. Gaillard de Champris. *Paris*: Gigord, 1946. 96 pp. Fr. 14.50.

Cadou, René-Guy.—Un hommage à la poésie. [Textes de Claudel, Fort etc.]. *Nantes*: Eds. du Fleuve, 1946. 103 pp. Fr. 450.

Castex, P., P. Surer et G. Becker.—Manuel des études littéraires françaises. I. Moyen âge. *Paris*: Hachette, 1946. 88 pp. Fr. 60.

Corneille.—Le Cid, éd. originale publ. par Maurice Cauchie. *Paris*: Didier, 1946. viii + 112 pp. Fr. 110. (Soc. des textes fr. mod.)

Del Litto, V.—Bibliographie stendhalienne, 1938-43. *Grenoble*: Arthaud, 1945. 31 pp.

Descaves, Lucien.—Deux amis: J.-K. Huysmans et l'abbé Mugnier. *Paris*: Plon, 1946. 145 pp. Fr. 300.

D'Ouakil, Basile G.—Jean de La Fontaine, le poète de tous les âges. *New York*: Vanni, 1946. 96 pp.

— Le Théâtre Français au XVII^e siècle. Corneille-Racine-Molière. *Ibid.*, 1946. 63 pp.

Drouillet, Jean.—Romanciers et conteurs nivernais. *Moulins*: Crépin-Leblond, 1946. 191 pp. Fr. 100.

Du Bos, Charles.—Le dialogue avec André Gide. *Paris*: Corrèa, 1947. 356 pp. Fr. 195.

- Dubuc, André.**—Villequier dans la vie et l'œuvre de Victor Hugo. *Rouen*: Lainé, 1946. 67 pp.
- Estang, Luc.**—Présence de Bernanos. *Paris*: Plon, 1947. 360 pp. Fr. 180.
- Ferre, André.**—Géographie littéraire. *Paris*: Eds. du Sagittaire, 1946. 95 pp. Fr. 90.
- Flaubert.**—Un cœur simple, Mémoires d'un fou, Novembre, éd. René Dumesnil. *Monaco*: Eds. du Rocher, 1946. xxxiv + 177 pp.
- Salammbo. Introd. d'Alexis Pitou, 1946. 274 pp. Fr. 400.
- Gillet, Louis.**—Clandel, Péguy. *Paris*: Eds. du Sagittaire, 1946. 245 pp. Fr. 180.
- Clandel présent. *Paris*: Librairie universelle de France, 1947. 108 pp. Fr. 110.
- Gossart, A.-M.**—Les Auteurs français. I. XVII^e siècle. Textes choisis. *Beyrouth*: Les Lettres françaises, 1944. 338 pp.
- Heugel, Jacques.**—Complément et corrections au Précis de versification française et au Dictionnaire des rimes françaises. *Paris*: Heugel, 1946. 64 pp. Fr. 40.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A.**—Das Fräulein von Seuderi. *Offenburg*: Lehrmittelverlag, 1946. xii + 90 pp.
- Isorni, Jacques.**—Le Procès de Robert Brasillach, 19 janvier 1945. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1946. 221 pp. Fr. 90.
- Jaloux, Edmond.**—Les saisons littéraires (1896-1903). *Paris*: Librairie universelle de France, 1947. 318 pp. Fr. 180.
- Jans, Adrien.**—Paul Claudel et la Belgique. *Paris*: Edit. Soleil, 1947. 155 pp. Fr. 130.
- Jouve, Pierre.**—Emile Brun, sa vie et ses œuvres posthumes, avec une lettre de Mistral. *Valence-sur-Rhône*: Eds. Rhodaniennes, 1946. 168 pp. Fr. 150.
- Kunel, Maurice.**—Verlaine et Rimbaud en Belgique. *Paris*: Edit. Soleil, 1947. 170 pp. Fr. 90.
- Baudelaire en Belgique. *Ibid.*, 1947. 210 pp. Fr. 90.
- Lacroix, René.**—Chateaubriand à Rodez. *Paris*: 34, rue de l'Echiquier, 1946. 87 pp.
- La Fayette.**—La Princesse de Clèves, éd. R. de Pampelonne. *Lyons*: I. A. C., 1946. xx + 167 pp. Fr. 24.
- La Fontaine.**—Fables choisies, éd. Pierre Clarac. *Paris*: Ass. pour la diffusion de la pensée fr., 1946. 464 pp. Fr. 75.
- Lantoine, Albert.**—Les "Lettres philosophiques" de Voltaire. *Paris*: S. F. E. L. T., 1946. 192 pp. Fr. 90.
- Lebel, Paul.**—Le Noms de personnes en France. *Paris*: Presses universitaires, 1946. 135 pp.
- Lees, R. R.**—Ballanche and Social Christianity. Abstract of an Ill. diss., 1946. 12 pp.
- L'Hopital, Madeleine.**—La notion d'artiste chez George Sand. *Paris*: Boivin, 1947. 310 pp. Fr. 400.
- Louÿs, Pierre.**—Correspondance de Claude Debussy et Pierre Louÿs, 1893-1904, éd. Henri Borgeaud. *Paris*: Corti, 1945. 207 pp. Fr. 135.
- Lyonnet, Henry.**—"Le Cid" de Corneille. *Paris*: S. F. E. L. T., 1946. 191 pp. Fr. 90.
- Martineau, René.**—Autour de J.-K. Huysmans. *Paris*: Desclée de Brouwer, 1946. 128 pp. Fr. 60.
- Mauriac, Claude.**—Malraux ou le mal du héros. *Paris*: Grasset, 1947. Fr. 300.
- Mauriac, François.**—Trois grands hommes devant Dieu: Molière, Rousseau, Flaubert. *Paris*: Hartmann, 1947. 112 pp. Fr. 60.
- Mérimée.**—Colomba, éd. Pierre Jourda. *Paris*: Droz, 1947. xxxii + 189 pp.
- Michaud, Guy.**—Message poétique du symbolisme. I. L'aventure poétique. Baudelaire, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, Lautréamont, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Mallarmé. *Paris*: Nizet, 1947. 248 pp. Fr. 250.
- Michel, P.**—Les Grands Ecrivains français par la dissertation. Moyen âge et XVI^e siècle. *Paris*: Foucher, 1946. 70 pp.
- Molière.**—L'Avare, éd. R. A. Wilson. *Boston*: Heath, n. d. lli + 126 pp. \$1.00.
- Le Malade imaginaire, éd. Pierre Valde. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1946. 199 pp.
- Le Tartuffe, éd. J. Calvet. *Paris*: Gigord, 1946. 135 pp. Fr. 14.50.
- Mongrédien, Georges.**—Madeleine de Scudéry et son salon, d'après des documents inédits. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1946. 239 pp. Fr. 175.
- Mornet, Daniel.**—Cours pratique de rédaction littéraire. *Paris*: Ecole univ. par corresp., 1946. 305 pp.
- Pelleau, Paul-T.**—Saint-Pol-Roux le Crucifié. *Nantes*: Eds. du Fleuve, 1946. 207 pp. Fr. 120.
- Pendell, William D.**—Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. 135 pp. \$2.50. (J. H. Studies, extra vol. 23.)
- Peyrade, Jean.**—Recherche de la joie à travers le roman français contemporain. *Paris*: Eds. Spes, 1946. 199 pp. Fr. 80.
- Soyer, Jacques.**—Recherches sur l'origine et la formation des noms de lieux du département du Loiret. *Orléans*: Houzé, 1943-6. 3 fascicules.
- Styger, Flora.**—Essai sur l'œuvre de Mme de Lafayette. *Zurich* diss., 1944. 199 pp.
- Turgeon, F. K.**—Cours pratique de français. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1947. xiv + 412 pp.

Rabelais.—L'Abbaye de Thélème, éd. critique par Raoul Morçay. *Paris*: Droz, 1947. 71 pp.

— Pantagruel, éd. critique par V. L. Saulmier. *Paris*: Droz, 1946. liii + 257 pp. Fr. 150.

Richard, Pierre.—La Bruyère et ses "Caractères." *Amiens*: Malfère, 1946. 267 pp. Fr. 200.

Romains et Duhamel.—Académie française. Réception de M. Jules Romains, le 7 nov. 1946. *Paris*: Eds. du "Monde," 1946. 20 pp.

Ronsard.—Sonnets pour Hélène, éd. critique par Jacques Lavaud. *Paris*: Droz, 1947. xxiv + 137 pp.

Sartre, J.-P.—Descartes. *Paris*: Librairie universelle de France, 1947. 154 pp. Fr. 150.

Van Tieghem, Philippe.—Petite histoire des grandes doctrines littéraires en France, de la Pléiade au Surréalisme. *Paris*: Presses universitaires, 1946. 303 pp. Fr. 200.

Vioux, Marcelle.—Tristan et Yseult, amants éternels. *Lyons*: Eds. Gutenberg, 1946. 160 pp. Fr. 65.

Wartburg, W. von, et Paul Zumthor.—Précis de syntaxe du français contemporain. *Berne*: Francke, 1947. 356 pp. Frs. s. 13.

White, L. W.—Representative French Criticism of les Rougon-Macquart, 1873-95. Abstract of an Ill. diss., 1947. 15 pp.

SPANISH

Alarcón, P. A. de.—El sombrero de tres picos, ed. Rafael Alberti. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Pleamar, 1944. 276 pp.

Alfonso X, Rey de Castilla. Selección y notas de Manuel Cardenal de Iracheta. *Madrid*: C.S.I.C., 1946. 247 pp.

Arco y Garay, Ricardo del.—La idea del imperio en la política y la literatura españolas. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1944. 819 pp.

Bécquer, G. A.—Rimas, ed. R. E. de Goicoechea. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1941. cxli + 142 pp.

Casariago Fernández, J. E.—Jovellanos o el equilibrio. *Madrid*: Imp. Talleres Penitenciarios, 1943. 202 pp.

Castro, Rosalía de.—Obras completas, ed. V. García Martí. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1944. cxi + 1432 pp.

Cervantes.—La gitanilla y La española inglesa, ed. A. Malo Zarco. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1943. 133 pp.

Ensayo de bibliografía marítima española. *Barcelona*: Escuela de la Casa Provincial de Caridad, 1943. ciii + 461 pp.

Espinosa, A. M.—Estudios sobre el español de Nuevo Méjico. II: Morfología. *Buenos Aires*: Fac. de filosofía y letras de la Univ. de Buenos Aires, 1946. xv + 394 pp.

Espronceda.—Poesías, ed. R. Eugenio de Goicoechea. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1941. lxxxvi + 274 pp.

García Blanco, Manuel.—Juan de! Encina como poeta lírico. *Oviedo*: Impr. La Cruz, 1944. 34 pp.

García López, José (ed.).—La Novela picaresca. *Barcelona*: Edit. Rauter, 1946. 183 pp.

García Lorca.—Anthologie poétique, éd. Félix Gattegno. *Paris*: Charlot, 1946. xviii + 227 pp. Fr. 250.

Garciasol, Ramón de.—Vida heroica de Miguel de Cervantes. *Madrid*: Edit. Nacional, 1944. 277 pp.

Góngora.—Antología poética, ed. Rafael Alberti. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Pleamar, 1945. 335 pp.

González López, Emilio.—Emilia Pardo Bazán, novelista de Galicia. *New York*: Hispanic Inst., 1944. 178 pp.

González Palencia, Angel.—Entre dos siglos. Estudios literarios (Segunda serie). *Madrid*: Inst. A. de Nebrija, 1943. viii + 376 pp.

Guerrieri Crocetti, C.—Studi sulla poesia di Gonzalo de Berceo. *Turin*: Paravia, 1942. 140 pp.

Gutiérrez-Noriega, Carbos.—Contribución de Cervantes a la psicología y a la psiquiatría. *Lima*: Edit. Lumen, 1944. 44 pp.

Isla, J. F. de.—Fray Gerundio de Campazas, ed. Francisco Esteve. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1943. 126 pp.

Janner, Hans.—La Glosa en el Siglo de Oro. Una Antología. *Madrid*: Eds. Nueva Epoca, 1946. 95 pp.

Jones, W. K.—Cuentos del Alto Perú. III: Alternate. *Boston*: Heath, 1947. iv + 52 pp. \$.44.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Poesía juglaresca y juglares. *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1942. 280 pp.

Morínigo, M. A.—América en el teatro de Lope de Vega. *Buenos Aires*: Fac. de filosofía y letras de la Univ. de Buenos Aires, 1946. 257 pp.

Pemán, José Maria (ed.).—Las Justas literarias de Cádiz. Recopilación y síntesis de los cuatro primeros años de 1942 a 1945. *Cádiz*: Edit. Escelicer, 1946. 295 pp.

Ríos Sarmiento, Juan.—La vida y los libros de Alfonso el Sabio. *Barcelona*: Juventud, 1943. 187 pp.

Rosal, Juan del.—Crimen y criminal en la

novela policíaca. *Madrid*: Inst. Edit. Reus, 1947. 411 pp.

Rueda, Salvador.—Antología poética, ed. Rafael Alberti. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Pleamar, 1944. 233 pp.

Sandoval, Adolfo de.—Menéndez y Pelayo. *Madrid*: Ediciones Morata, 1944.

Santullano, Luis (ed.).—Romancero español. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1943. xv + 1133 pp.

Sedo Peris-Mencheta, Juan.—Ensayo de una Bibliografía de Miscelánea Cervantina. *Barcelona*: Author, 1946. xlvii + 241 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Cardos del jardín de Lope. Sátiras ed. por Joaquín de Entrambasaguas. *Madrid*: Inst. Nicolás Antonio, 1942. 63 pp.

—Comedia de El caballero de Olmedo, ed. E. J. Martínez. *Madrid*: Inst. Nicolás Antonio, 1944. 213 pp.

Villalón, Fernando.—Poesías, ed. J. M. de Cossío. *Madrid*: Hispánica, 1944. 187 pp.

Walsh, Gertrude M.—Vamos al sur. *Boston*: Heath, 1947. xviii + 268 pp. \$1.88.

Zamora Vicente, Alonso.—El habla de Mérida y sus cercanías. *Madrid*: 1943. 153 pp.

Zorrilla, José.—Obras completas, ed. N. Alonso Cortes. 2 v. *Valladolid*: Santarén, 1943.

PORTUGUESE

Almeida, N. T. de.—Sátiras, ed. Rodrigues Lapa. *Lisbon*: a. c. p., 1941. xvi + 92 pp.

Barros, F. de Araujo.—Língua portuguesa: origens e história. *Oporto*: Educação Nacional, 1942. 122 pp.

Barroso, Gustavo (ed.).—Os melhores contos históricos de Portugal. *Rio de Janeiro*: Dois mundos, 1943. 305 pp.

Camões.—Lírica, ed. crítica pelo Dr. José Maria Rodrigues e Afonso Lopes Vieira. *Coimbra*: Universidade, 1942. xl + 385 + lxxxiv pp.

Figueiredo, Fidelino de.—Depois de Eça de Queiroz. *São Paulo*: Edit. Clássico-Científica, 1943. 134 pp.

Kany, C. E. and J. B. Pinheiro.—Spoken Portuguese for Students and Travelers to Brazil. *Boston*: Heath, 1947. xiv + 187 pp. \$1.36.

Lima, Jorge de (ed.).—Os melhores contos rústicos de Portugal. *Rio de Janeiro*: Dois mundos, 1943. 322 pp.

Medeiros, F. S. de.—Antero de Quental. *Rio de Janeiro*: Noite, 1939. 402 pp.

Moraes, C. D. de.—A inquietação e o fim trágico de A. de Quental. *Porto Alegre*: Globo, 1939. 151 pp.

Paiva Boleo, M. de.—O estudo dos dialectos y falares portugueses. *Coimbra*: 1942. 152 pp.

Revêlo de Bettencourt.—Teófilo Braga mestre nacionalista. *Lisbon*: Gazeta dos Caminhos de Ferro, 1942. 55 pp.

Séguier, Jaime de.—Dicionário prático ilustrado. *Oporto*: Lello & Irmão, 1941. 1812 pp.

RUSSIAN

Birkett, G. A.—A Modern Russian Course. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1947. xii + 330 pp. \$2.50.

Blesnay, Claude de.—Vie de Pouchkine. *Paris*: Eds. Spes, 1946. 406 pp. Fr. 180.

Borščak, Elie.—Lettres ukrainiennes avec grammaire, commentaire et lexique. *Paris*: Droz, 1946. 153 pp. Fr. 300.

Hofman, M. et R.—Gogol, sa vie et son œuvre. *Paris*: Corrêa, 1946. 284 pp. Fr. 162.

Klimenko, Iwan.—Das russische Sprichwort: Formen und konstruktive Eigentümlichkeiten. *Bern*: Francke, 1946. 101 pp.

Tkhorjevsky, Ivan.—Russian Literature [in Russian]. 2 v. *Paris*: La Renaissance, 1946.

GENERAL

Baker, E. J.—Australian Language. *Sydney*: Angus and Robertson, 1946. 426 pp.

Blanchard, L. R.—See France. *Rochester*: Gannett Newspapers, 1946. 118 pp.

Crowley, W. I.—Introduction to Literary Mongolian. *Birmingham, Ala.*: Pangloss, 1946. x + 54 + 5 pp. \$2.00.

Cumulative Catalog of Library of Congress. Jan.-March, 1947. *Washington*: Library of Congress, 1947. 335 pp. lithotyped, 3 cols. a page. [There are to be 9 monthly issues, 3 quarterly cumulations, of which this is the first, and an annual cumulation.]

Ernout, Alfred.—Prose latine. *Montreal*: Eds. Lumen, 1947. 285 pp. \$1.75.

Faublée, Jacques.—Introduction au malgache. *Paris*: Maisonneuve, 1946. 149 pp.

Fenneberg, Paul.—Danish Phrase Book. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1946. 24 pp. 1/6.

Haarhoff, T. J.—The ABC of Afrikaans. *London*: Gordon and Gotch, 1946. 142 pp. 3/6.

The Humanistic Tradition in the Century Ahead. Princeton U. Bicentennial Conferences. Series I, conference 6. *Princeton*: Princeton U., 1946. 32 pp.

Sturtevant, E. H.—An Introduction to Linguistic Science. vi + 173 pp. \$3.00.

1947

os dia-
imbras

Braga
eta dos

prático
, 1941

Course
xii +

chkin
180.

es ave
Paris

et son
p. Fr

Sprich-
rentüm-
01 pp.
erature
issance,

. Syd-
6 pp.

hester:

literary
angloss,

ongress,
rary of
3 cols.
issues,
this is

ntreal:

u mal-
149 pp.
e Book.
p. 1/6.
frikans.
142 pp.

Century
Confer-
nceton:

tion to
\$3.00.

lia-
re:

aga
dos

ico
41.

rse.
+

ne.

vee
is:

son
Fr.

ch-
im-
p.
ure
nce,

yd-
p.

er:

ary
oss,

ess,
of
ols.
ues,
is

cal:

nal-
pp.
pok.
1/6.
ans.
pp.

ury
fer-
ton:

a to
0.

A Princeton Book

STUDIES ON VOLTAIRE

By IRA O. WADE

A companion volume to the author's *Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet*, this book further clarifies the crucial Cirey Period through an investigation of certain papers of Madame du Châtelet which have long remained unnoticed in Voltaire's library at Leningrad. The papers — a translation of a portion of Mandeville, a chapter of a treatise on optics, and three chapters of a work on grammar — are here reproduced and made the focus of a series of studies which reexamine and challenge previous conclusions on the evolution of Voltaire's thought.

No. 6, *Princeton Publications in
Romance Languages*

260 PAGES

\$3.00

At your bookstore

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

Announcing three new editions of
MOLIÈRE

With notes, illustrations, and full end vocabularies

**L'Avare
Le Misanthrope
Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme**

Edited by RONALD A. WILSON

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

THE OWLES ALMANACKE

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By DON CAMERON ALLEN

This anonymous satire by one of Dekker's disciples is the best parody of the serious prognostication before Swift's assault on Partridge. Published in 1618, it surpasses the limits of its five English predecessors by burlesquing the almanac in all of its gaudy departments. The pseudo-scientific manner of the astrologers, their insistence on classical origins, their love of precise instruments, their engagements with the muses of verse, and their fuzzy jargon are all ludicrously mocked. The latter part of the work, in which a series of prognostications are made for the London Companies, goes beyond the scope of the professional prognostication to intrude upon the realm of "character-books." Besides its satirical and literary values, *The Owles Almanacke* is an interesting document for the student of Jacobean times. It contains allusions to the theatrical and literary activities of the day, accounts of the modes and manners of contemporary life, and a gallery of ordinary Londoners that are seldom encountered in works prior to Dickens'.

This satire has been edited from the three extant copies and provided with an introductory essay in which the editor attempts to supply a background for the reader by discussing the vogue of astrology and the history of the burlesque prognostication. To make the target of the satire less obscure, he has described a typical almanac and prognostication of the early seventeenth century.

Pp. vii + 103; 2 plates. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE